

Charles L. Ferree to be postmaster at St. Clair, Pa., in place of Joseph H. Denning, deceased.

Daniel J. Gensemer to be postmaster at Pine Grove, Pa., in place of George W. Schmeltzer. Incumbent's commission expired June 22, 1910.

Isaac N. Lightner to be postmaster at Ephrata, Pa., in place of Isaac N. Lightner. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1911.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

M. B. Cross to be postmaster at Ferguson, S. C., in place of Alton H. Felder, resigned.

M. J. Spears to be postmaster at Lamar, S. C. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Julia E. D. Tolbert to be postmaster at Ninety Six, S. C., in place of Julia E. De Loach, name changed by marriage.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

Charles S. Harter to be postmaster at Elk Point, S. Dak., in place of John F. Reid. Incumbent's commission expired June 28, 1910.

Hiram A. Mason to be postmaster at Bowdle, S. Dak., in place of Evan J. Edwards. Incumbent's commission expired February 18, 1911.

William A. Schwichtenberg to be postmaster at Kadoka, S. Dak., in place of Leonore Green, resigned.

May A. Knappen to be postmaster at Sisseton, S. Dak., in place of Charles C. Knappen, deceased.

TENNESSEE.

Willis F. Arnold to be postmaster at Jackson, Tenn., in place of Joseph J. Losier, removed.

James S. Byrd to be postmaster at Jonesboro, Tenn., in place of Frank E. Britton, removed.

Edward E. Hathaway to be postmaster at Elizabethton, Tenn., in place of Edwin C. Alexander, removed.

Wayne J. Johnson to be postmaster at Oakdale, Tenn. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

W. S. Latta to be postmaster at Somerville Tenn., in place of John D. McCarley. Incumbent's commission expired January 19, 1907.

Alvin J. Roller to be postmaster at Bristol, Tenn., in place of Eli A. Warren, removed.

TEXAS.

Malvina M. Anderson to be postmaster at Roby, Tex. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Clara A. Boynton to be postmaster at Anson, Tex., in place of J. W. Boynton, resigned.

E. N. Browning to be postmaster at Center, Tex., in place of Henry Liem. Incumbent's commission expired January 10, 1909.

E. G. Crabbe to be postmaster at Corpus Christi, Tex., in place of Thomas D. Ward. Incumbent's commission expired April 23, 1910.

R. E. Dorsey to be postmaster at McLean, Tex., in place of H. W. Mullis, resigned.

John A. Hooker to be postmaster at New Boston, Tex., in place of Richard B. Harrison. Incumbent's commission expired May 28, 1910.

A. D. Hollingshead to be postmaster at Ganado, Tex. Office became presidential October 1, 1910.

Leander Hopkins to be postmaster at Ferris, Tex., in place of Leander Hopkins. Incumbent's commission expired February 13, 1911.

Benjamin F. Robey to be postmaster at Coleman, Tex., in place of James O. Brown, resigned.

George W. L. Smith to be postmaster at Henderson, Tex., in place of Ellie V. Flanagan, removed.

VIRGINIA.

Waverly S. Barrett to be postmaster at Dendron, Va. Office became presidential January 1, 1911.

Joel W. Hortenstine to be postmaster at Abingdon, Va., in place of Oscar L. James. Incumbent's commission expired January 31, 1911.

Howard T. Jenkins to be postmaster at East Radford, Va., in place of T. B. Einstein. Incumbent's commission expired January 30, 1910.

Annie E. Martin to be postmaster at Waverly, Va., in place of Annie E. Martin. Incumbent's commission expired January 12, 1911.

James T. Waddill to be postmaster at Victoria, Va. Office became presidential April 1, 1911.

WEST VIRGINIA.

E. E. Wells to be postmaster at Pennsboro, W. Va., in place of William H. Lantz. Incumbent's commission expired December 6, 1910.

Albert S. Winter to be postmaster at Moundsville, W. Va., in place of Alonzo E. Linch. Incumbent's commission expired March 22, 1910.

WISCONSIN.

Robert V. Baker to be postmaster at Kenosha, Wis., in place of John B. Maloney, resigned.

W. A. Jones to be postmaster at Oconomowoc, Wis., in place of John G. Gorth, removed.

Henry G. Kress to be postmaster at Manitowoc, Wis., in place of Henry G. Kress. Incumbent's commission expired May 10, 1910.

Clayton G. Morgan to be postmaster at Oakfield, Wis. Office became presidential January 1, 1910.

John F. Shaw to be postmaster at Ellsworth, Wis., in place of Eldon D. Woodworth. Incumbent's commission expired February 28, 1911.

George W. Smith to be postmaster at Amherst, Wis., in place of Andrew Moberg, resigned.

James D. Strickland to be postmaster at New Lisbon, Wis., in place of James D. Strickland. Incumbent's commission expired March 1, 1911.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, April 5, 1911.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., as follows:

Almighty God, our heavenly Father, we invoke Thy blessing upon the new Congress now convened. Impress, we beseech Thee, each Member of this House with the great responsibility resting upon him, that with high ideals of statesmanship he may give the best that is in him to his country. Let Thy blessing descend upon the Speaker, that with clear perceptions, noble endeavors, and lofty purposes he may preside over the deliberations of this House with justice and equity and lead on to the highest results. For Thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE TO NOTIFY THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, the committee appointed under a resolution of the House to wait upon the President reports that in conjunction with a similar committee of the Senate it has performed its duty, that the President desires it to present his friendly greetings to Congress and to say that he will without delay communicate further in writing.

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 30.

Resolved, That the House shall proceed to consider the pending House resolution providing rules for the House of Representatives of the Sixty-second Congress under the following terms, to wit:

First. At the conclusion of the first reading of the resolution it shall be in order to offer one substitute for the resolution of the gentleman from Texas.

Second. There shall be four hours' general debate, the time to be equally divided between the friends and opponents of the resolution, the time to be controlled on one side by Mr. HENRY of Texas and on the other by Mr. MANN, of Illinois.

Third. At the conclusion of the general debate as herein provided, a vote shall be taken without delay or intervening motion—first, on the question of adopting the substitute, if any, and then on the question of adopting the resolution of the gentleman from Texas or the substitute resolution, as the case may be.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the previous question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Nebraska?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield for a question.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the gentleman if he will not consent to permit amendments to be offered by any Member? It seems hardly fair that it should be confined to one motion to offer a substitute. There are many Members here,

who in the best of faith desire to offer some amendments, who would like the privilege of doing so.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman will understand that I am presenting this as a party measure, as a caucus action, and there is an opportunity for a substitute. The gentleman can embody his amendments in any substitute that may be proper. These rules are being presented as a party measure, as I say. There will be four hours of general debate. There is an opportunity given to offer a substitute, and the gentleman's party can offer a substitute with any modifications of the rules as heretofore obtained as they see proper, and there will be ample opportunity to present their side of the question just as we are presenting ours.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will yield for a question or for a suggestion.

Mr. NORRIS. It is in the nature of a suggestion. I could not confine it to a question. There are a good many of us who believe that the adoption of rules is not a party question, and who desire to take no party advantage whatever on the question of rules, but who would like an opportunity of presenting amendments that would perhaps not be contained in the substitute which would be offered. I will say, frankly, to the gentleman that I do not know what the substitute is going to be. If it were the old rules of the House, I would prefer the rules that the gentleman has reported, but still I would like an opportunity, and there are many others like me here, to offer some amendments even to those rules. It would be of little advantage to us if we had a right to debate it and have no right to vote on any of the amendments that might be offered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let me suggest to the gentleman that all these questions of which he speaks can be considered later in the House and by the Committee on Rules. The gentleman's party will undoubtedly offer a substitute and possibly may embrace the propositions suggested by the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. Oh, I think not; I am satisfied from past experience it will not embrace some propositions that I want to offer. [Laughter.]

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman from Texas yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Illinois?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. Is not the gentleman willing first to concede some debate on the adoption of the rule?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. You mean on this resolution?

Mr. MANN. On the adoption of this rule.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Certainly I am.

Mr. MANN. So that the gentleman will withhold his motion for the previous question and possibly agree upon some time for debate.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes; undoubtedly.

Mr. MANN. Now, may—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let me say to the gentleman I am perfectly willing to have 20 minutes on a side on this question, and that at the end the previous question shall be considered as ordered.

Mr. MANN. Now, let me make this further inquiry in the way of a suggestion, and that is whether the gentlemen on that side of the House would not be willing to proceed to-day to general debate on the resolution in reference to the rules and then to-morrow give opportunity to offer amendments to the rules? I suggest to the gentleman I do not understand that the caucus on that side of the House has decided that there might be no amendments offered. I understand that the caucus, naturally, on that side of the House would resist any amendments unless we can present some amendments which I think will appeal to the gentleman himself.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Well, if the gentleman can do that, suppose we go ahead with the adoption of this resolution and later, then, perhaps you might persuade us.

Mr. NORRIS. But the adoption of this resolution, let me suggest to the gentleman, would preclude that.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We can adopt this, and then we will come to the other—

Mr. MANN. The gentleman has authority at any time to move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand that.

Mr. MANN. Why would not the gentleman be willing to proceed—

Mr. McCALL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I only yielded to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. And I was trying to ask a question.

Mr. McCALL. I simply wanted to make a parliamentary inquiry, and that was if it was not in order to read the message of the President, which has just been received?

The SPEAKER. Why, the Chair thought that would be done. Mr. HENRY of Texas. As soon as we settle this question I am perfectly willing to yield.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentlemen on that side of the House be willing to proceed with general debate for the four hours first, as they will have the right to move the previous question, so that they will not now foreclose any opportunity for amendments if amendments be presented to which they might agree?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will state to the gentleman candidly I would rather proceed in this way and allow 20 minutes of debate on each side on this resolution, and then we can come to the other question.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Sundry messages, in writing, from the President of the United States were communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CUSTOMS LAWS.

The SPEAKER. Without prejudice to the position of the gentleman from Texas, the Chair lays before the House the following message (H. Doc. No. 3) from the President of the United States, which the Clerk will read.

The message was read, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

The Clerk read as follows:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

In accordance with the provisions of the act approved August 5, 1909, making appropriation "to enable the President to secure information and to assist the officers of the Government in the administration of the customs laws, as provided in section 2 of the tariff bill, relating to the maximum and minimum rates," I transmit herewith a detailed statement of all expenditures under this provision for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1910.

WM. H. TAFT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, April 5, 1911.

CANADIAN RECIPROCITY.

The SPEAKER. The Chair also lays before the House the following message (H. Doc. No. 2) from the President of the United States.

The message was read, referred to the Committee on Ways and Means, and ordered to be printed.

[For message see proceedings of the Senate for this day.]

THE RULES.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Now, Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] for the suggestion he was about to make.

Mr. MANN. The inquiry I made of the gentleman was whether he would not be willing on that side to proceed with the general debate on the rules for four hours, and at the end of that time determine whether that side of the House would not give to this side of the House opportunity to offer amendments?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Let us first get this resolution out of the way.

Mr. MANN. That gets the whole thing out of the way.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. And if the gentleman desires 20 minutes on this resolution I am perfectly willing to concede it.

Mr. KENDALL rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. KENDALL]?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for a question; yes.

Mr. KENDALL. What I want to know is this: Is it the purpose of the gentleman from Texas to submit these rules as printed to the House, with no alternative to amend except by a substitute en bloc?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. It is.

Mr. WEEKS. I would like to make an inquiry.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman for the inquiry.

Mr. WEEKS. At the convening of the Fifty-ninth Congress the leader of the minority made an eloquent appeal supporting a motion which he made that the rules of the last Congress be

adopted tentatively for 30 days and then have them taken up for consideration—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I desire to say that is hardly an inquiry. It seems to be a speech.

Mr. WEEKS. It is not a speech. He made a motion to that effect, and based that motion on the fact largely that the new Members—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I decline to yield further. That seems to be a statement.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] declines to yield.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will yield to the gentleman, however, for a question.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman stated this resolution was a party measure, and therefore thought it proper. I wish to ask if the gentleman's position is that, upon party measures, reasonable opportunity to offer amendments on the floor shall be denied to Members?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I desire to say to the gentleman that he limits my words too strictly. It is hardly a party measure, but a caucus action, and these rules have been made so good that I think the gentleman will find no difficulty in voting for them as proposed by this side of the House.

I move the previous question on the resolution.

Mr. MANN. I understood the gentleman was going to yield some time first.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will agree that we shall have 20 minutes on a side for debate, by unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] moves the previous question.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Texas have permission, without yielding the floor, to yield to me 20 minutes. That gives him the authority.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, by permission of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] I make this suggestion, namely, that by unanimous consent we agree to 20 minutes' debate on a side on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas, and at the end of that time the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and the vote taken.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That was my proposition to the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] again state his request?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The request is that the House have 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], and that at the end of the 40 minutes, without intervening motion, the House shall proceed to vote on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] asks unanimous consent that the House have 40 minutes' debate, 20 minutes to be controlled by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and 20 minutes by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], and then that the previous question shall be considered ordered without intervening motion.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, does that mean, then, that there is to be no further debate on the question of the adoption of these rules?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Not at all. The resolution provides for the rules.

The SPEAKER. Unless there is objection—

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Mr. Speaker, I am constrained to object, because I think there ought to be a roll call on the motion for the previous question in this instance.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. You can have it when we get to that, if you desire it.

I move the previous question, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question. Those in favor of it will say "aye;" those opposed will say "no." The ayes seem to have it—

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays, Mr. Speaker.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 205, nays 138, answered "present" 1, not voting 44, as follows:

YEAS—205.

| | | | |
|----------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| Adair | Barnhart | Buchanan | Carlisle |
| Adamson | Bartlett | Bulkley | Carter |
| Aiken, S. C. | Bathrick | Burke, Wis. | Clark, Fla. |
| Akin, N. Y. | Beall, Tex. | Burleson | Claypool |
| Alexander | Blackmon | Burnett | Clayton |
| Allen | Boehne | Byrnes, S. C. | Cline |
| Anderson, Ohio | Booher | Byrns, Tenn. | Collier |
| Ansberry | Borland | Callaway | Connell |
| Ashbrook | Brantley | Candler | Conry |
| Ayers | Brown | Cantrill | Covington |

| | | | |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Cox, Ind. | Graham | Linthicum | Shackleford |
| Cox, Ohio | Gray | Littlepage | Sharp |
| Cravens | Gregg, Pa. | Littleton | Sheppard |
| Cullop | Gregg, Tex. | Lloyd | Sherley |
| Curley | Gudger | Lobeck | Sherwood |
| Daugherty | Hamilton, W. Va. | McCoy | Sims |
| Davis, W. Va. | Hamlin | McGillicuddy | Sisson |
| Dent | Hammond | Macon | Slayden |
| Denver | Hardwick | Maguire, Nebr. | Small |
| Dickinson | Hardy | Martin, Colo. | Smith, N. Y. |
| Dickson, Miss. | Harrison, Miss. | Mays | Smith, Tex. |
| Dies | Harrison, N. Y. | Moore, Tex. | Sparkman |
| Difenderfer | Hay | Morrison | Stanley |
| Dixon, Ind. | Hefflin | Moss, Ind. | Stedman |
| Donohoe | Helm | Murray | Stephens, Miss. |
| Doughton | Henry, Tex. | Oldfield | Stephens, Tex. |
| Driscoll, D. A. | Hensley | O'Shaunessy | Stone |
| Dupre | Hobson | Padgett | Sulzer |
| Edwards | Holland | Page | Sweet |
| Ellerbe | Houston | Palmer | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Estopinal | Hughes, Ga. | Patten, N. Y. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Evans | Hull | Pepper | Taylor, Colo. |
| Falsen | Humphreys, Miss. | Peters | Thayer |
| Ferris | Jacoway | Post | Thomas |
| Fields | James | Pou | Townsend |
| Finley | Johnson, Ky. | Pujo | Tribble |
| Fitzgerald | Johnson, S. C. | Rainey | Turnbull |
| Flood, Va. | Jones | Raker | Tuttle |
| Floyd, Ark. | Kent | Randell, Tex. | Underhill |
| Fornes | Kindred | Ransdell, La. | Underwood |
| Foster, Ill. | Kipp | Rauch | Watkins |
| Francis | Kitchin | Richardson | Webb |
| Garner | Konop | Riordan | Whitacre |
| Garrett | Korbly | Robinson | White |
| George | Lafferty | Roddenberry | Wickliffe |
| Goeke | Lamb | Rothermel | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Goldfogle | Latta | Rouse | Wilson, Pa. |
| Goodwin, Ark. | Lee, Ga. | Ruby | Witherspoon |
| Gordon | Lee, Pa. | Rucker, Colo. | Young, Tex. |
| Gould | Legare | Rucker, Mo. | |
| | Lever | Russell | |
| | Lewis | Scully | |

NAYS—138.

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| Anderson, Minn. | Foss | Langley | Pray |
| Andrus | Foster, Vt. | Lawrence | Prince |
| Anthony | French | Lenroot | Rees |
| Austin | Fuller | Lindbergh | Roberts, Mass. |
| Barchfeld | Gardner, Mass. | Longworth | Roberts, Nev. |
| Bartholdt | Gardner, N. J. | McCall | Rodenberg |
| Berger | Gillett | McCreary | Sells |
| Bowman | Good | McKinley | Simmons |
| Bradley | Greene | McKinney | Slemp |
| Burke, S. Dak. | Griest | McLaughlin | Sloan |
| Butler | Guernsey | McMorrin | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Calder | Hamilton, Mich. | Madden | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Campbell | Hanna | Madison | Speer |
| Cannon | Harris | Malby | Steenerson |
| Catlin | Hartman | Mann | Stephens, Cal. |
| Cooper | Hawley | Martin, S. Dak. | Sterling |
| Copley | Hayes | Matthews | Stevens, Minn. |
| Crago | Heald | Miller | Sulloway |
| Crumpacker | Helgesen | Mitchell | Switzer |
| Currier | Henry, Conn. | Mondell | Thistlewood |
| Dalzell | Higgins | Moore, Pa. | Tilson |
| Danforth | Hill | Morgan | Towner |
| Davidson | Hinds | Morse, Wis. | Utter |
| Davis, Minn. | Howland | Mott | Volstead |
| De Forest | Hubbard | Murdock | Warburton |
| Dodds | Humphrey, Wash. | Needham | Wedemeyer |
| Draper | Jackson | Nelson | Weeks |
| Driscoll, M. E. | Kendall | Norris | Wildner |
| Dwight | Kennedy | Nye | Willis |
| Dyer | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Olmsted | Wilson, Ill. |
| Esch | Knowland | Parran | Wood, N. J. |
| Fairchild | Kopp | Patton, Pa. | Woods, Iowa |
| Farr | Lafear | Payne | Young, Kans. |
| Focht | La Follette | Porter | |
| Fordney | Langham | Powers | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Kinkead, N. J.

NOT VOTING—44.

| | | | |
|------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| Ames | Godwin, N. C. | Loud | Prouty |
| Bates | Hamill | Loudenslager | Redfield |
| Bell, Ga. | Haugen | McDermott | Reilly |
| Bingham | Howard | McGuire, Okla. | Sabath |
| Broussard | Howell | McHenry | Saunders |
| Burgess | Hughes, N. J. | McKenzie | Smith, Cal. |
| Burke, Pa. | Hughes, W. Va. | Maher | Stack |
| Cary | Kahn | Moon, Pa. | Talbot, Md. |
| Davenport | Konig | Moon, Tenn. | Taylor, Ohio |
| Fowler | Levy | Pickett | Vreeland |
| Gallagher | Lindsay | Plumley | Young, Mich. |

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. BELL of Georgia with Mr. AMES.

Mr. HOWARD with Mr. HUGHES of West Virginia.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland with Mr. BATES.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey with Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma.

Mr. LINDSAY with Mr. PROUTY.

Mr. MCHENRY with Mr. VREELAND.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey with Mr. LOUDENSLAGER.

Mr. FOWLER with Mr. BURKE of Pennsylvania.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. MOON of Pennsylvania.

Mr. SAUNDERS with Mr. HOWELL.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey, Mr. WICKLIFFE, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland appeared before the Speaker's desk and asked to be recorded.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that these gentlemen do not bring themselves within the rules and practice of the House of Representatives, in that they are generally required to state that they were present and listening and did not hear their names called.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will attend to that.

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I just came in when my name was called and had no opportunity to answer.

The SPEAKER. Did the gentleman hear his name called?

Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland. No; but a gentleman told me it was called.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is not entitled to vote.

Mr. KINKEAD of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I am recorded as voting "yea" on this proposition. I was paired with the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER]. I desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The result of the vote was then announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The question now recurs on the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY].

Mr. MANN. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, pending that, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CANNON. I understood that 20 minutes on a side for debate was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. That was offered to our friends on that side, but was rejected.

Mr. CANNON. Then I was in error.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. CRUMPACKER] objected.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. It was only offered on condition that the previous question be agreed to without a roll call.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 200, nays 135, answered "present" 1, not voting 52, as follows:

YEAS—200.

| | | | |
|----------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Adair | Dixon, Ind. | Humphreys, Miss. | Richardson |
| Adamson | Donohoe | Jacoway | Riordan |
| Aiken, S. C. | Doremus | James | Robinson |
| Akin, N. Y. | Doughton | Johnson, Ky. | Roddenbery |
| Alexander | Dupre | Jones | Rothermel |
| Allen | Edwards | Kent | Rouse |
| Anderson, Ohio | Ellerbe | Kipp | Rubey |
| Ansberry | Estopinal | Kitchin | Rucker, Colo. |
| Ashbrook | Evans | Konig | Rucker, Mo. |
| Ayers | Faison | Konop | Russell |
| Barnhart | Ferris | Lafferty | Saunders |
| Bartlett | Fields | Lamb | Scully |
| Bathrick | Finley | Latta | Shackleford |
| Beall, Tex. | Fitzgerald | Lee, Ga. | Sharp |
| Bell, Ga. | Flood, Va. | Lee, Pa. | Sheppard |
| Blackmon | Floyd, Ark. | Lever | Sherley |
| Boehne | Fornes | Levy | Sherwood |
| Booher | Foster, Ill. | Linthicum | Sims |
| Borland | Francis | Littlepage | Sisson |
| Brown | Garner | Littleton | Slayden |
| Buchanan | Garrett | Lloyd | Small |
| Bulkley | George | Lobeck | Smith, Tex. |
| Burke, Wis. | Glass | McCoy | Stanley |
| Burleson | Goeke | McGillcuddy | Stedman |
| Burnett | Goldfogle | Macon | Stephens, Miss. |
| Byrnes, S. C. | Goodwin, Ark. | Maguire, Nebr. | Stephens, Tex. |
| Byrns, Tenn. | Gordon | Maher | Stone |
| Callaway | Gould | Martin, Colo. | Sulzer |
| Candler | Graham | Mays | Sweet |
| Cantrill | Gray | Moore, Tex. | Talbot, Md. |
| Carter | Gregg, Pa. | Morrison | Talcott, N. Y. |
| Clark, Fla. | Gregg, Tex. | Moss, Ind. | Taylor, Ala. |
| Claypool | Gudger | Murray | Taylor, Colo. |
| Clayton | Hamilton, W. Va. | Oldfield | Thayer |
| Cline | Hamlin | O'Shaunessy | Thomas |
| Collier | Hammond | Padgett | Townsend |
| Connell | Hardwick | Page | Tribble |
| Conry | Hardy | Palmer | Turnbull |
| Cox, Ind. | Harrison, Miss. | Patten, N. Y. | Tuttle |
| Cox, Ohio | Harrison, N. Y. | Pepper | Underhill |
| Cravens | Hay | Peters | Underwood |
| Cullop | Hedlin | Post | Watkins |
| Daugherty | Helm | Pou | Webb |
| Davis, W. Va. | Henry, Tex. | Pujo | Whitacre |
| Dent | Hensley | Raney | White |
| Denver | Hobson | Raker | Wickliffe |
| Dickinson | Holland | Randell, Tex. | Wilson, N. Y. |
| Dickson, Miss. | Houston | Ransdell, La. | Wilson, Pa. |
| Dies | Hughes, Ga. | Rauch | Witherspoon |
| Difenderfer | Hull | Rellly | Young, Tex. |

NAYS—135.

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|-----------------|
| Ames | Bradley | Crago | Driscoll, M. E. |
| Anderson, Minn. | Burke, S. Dak. | Crumpacker | Dwight |
| Andrus | Butler | Currier | Dyer |
| Anthony | Calder | Dalzell | Esch |
| Austin | Campbell | Danforth | Fairchild |
| Barchfeld | Cannon | Davidson | Farr |
| Bartholdt | Catlin | De Forest | Focht |
| Bates | Cooper | Dodds | Fordney |
| Bowman | Copley | Draper | Foster, Vt. |

| | | | |
|-----------------|-----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| French | Kendall | Miller | Rodenberg |
| Fuller | Kennedy | Mitchell | Simmons |
| Gardner, Mass. | Kinkaid, Nebr. | Mondell | Slemp |
| Gardner, N. J. | Knowland | Moon, Pa. | Sloan |
| Gillett | Kopp | Moore, Pa. | Smith, J. M. C. |
| Good | Lafear | Morgan | Smith, Saml. W. |
| Greene | La Follette | Morse, Wis. | Speer |
| Griest | Langham | Mott | Stephens, Cal. |
| Guernsey | Langley | Murdock | Sterling |
| Hamilton, Mich. | Lawrence | Needham | Stevens, Minn. |
| Hanna | Lenroot | Nelson | Sulloway |
| Harris | Lindbergh | Norris | Switzer |
| Hawley | Longworth | Nye | Tilson |
| Hayes | McCall | Olmsted | Towner |
| Heald | McCreary | Parran | Utter |
| Helgesen | McGuire, Okla. | Payne | Volstead |
| Henry, Conn. | McKinney | Porter | Warburton |
| Higgins | McLaughlin | Powers | Wedemeyer |
| Hill | McMorran | Pray | Weeks |
| Hinds | Madden | Prince | Wilder |
| Howell | Madison | Prouty | Willis |
| Howland | Malby | Rees | Wilson, Ill. |
| Hubbard | Mann | Rees | Wood, N. J. |
| Humphrey, Wash. | Martin, S. Dak. | Roberts, Mass. | Young, Kans. |
| Jackson | Matthews | Roberts, Nev. | |

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Kinkaid, N. J.

NOT VOTING—52.

| | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|-------------|--------------|
| Berger | Foss | Korbly | Redfield |
| Bingham | Fowler | Legare | Sabath |
| Brantley | Gallagher | Lewis | Sells |
| Broussard | Godwin, N. C. | Lindsay | Smith, Cal. |
| Burgess | Hamill | Loud | Smith, N. Y. |
| Burke, Pa. | Hartman | Loudenlager | Sparkman |
| Carlin | Haugen | McDermott | Stack |
| Cary | Howard | McHenry | Steenerson |
| Covington | Hughes, N. J. | McKenzie | Taylor, Ohio |
| Curley | Hughes, W. Va. | McKinley | Thistlewood |
| Davenport | Johnson, S. C. | Moon, Tenn. | Vreeland |
| Davis, Minn. | Kahn | Pickett | Woods, Iowa |
| Driscoll, D. A. | Kindred | Plumley | Young, Mich. |

So the resolution was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. CARLIN with Mr. FOSS.

Mr. COVINGTON with Mr. HARTMAN.

Mr. BRANTLEY with Mr. DAVIS of Minnesota.

Mr. DANIEL A. DRISCOLL with Mr. WOODS of Iowa.

Mr. KORBLY with Mr. MCKINLEY.

Mr. SPARKMAN with Mr. THISTLEWOOD.

Mr. MOON of Tennessee with Mr. SELLS.

Mr. SELLS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recorded as voting no.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman wish to change his vote?

Mr. SELLS. No; I want to vote.

The SPEAKER. Was the gentleman in the House listening for his name?

Mr. SELLS. I was not.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not bring himself within the rule.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, 19 years ago a distinguished gentleman, several times Speaker, said on the floor of the House of Representatives:

I have been 15 years in Congress and I never saw a Speaker's decision overruled, and you will never live to see it, either.

That language was uttered by Thomas B. Reed, of Maine. His prophetic vision, in the light of recent history, does not seem to have been entirely correct. Since that time the country has seen the decisions of Speakers overruled on several occasions. It is but fair to say that perhaps some of the reasons which impelled the House to thus act did not come entirely from a defect in the rules themselves, but from the abusive administration of their provisions.

The country inquired the reason for these things. They considered it and have entered their decree, and the Democratic Party is here to-day for the purpose of keeping its plighted faith and restoring this body to its ancient functions as the representative body of the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I assume that the gentlemen do not intend to offer a substitute under the provisions of the special order. But I pause to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois whether he proposes to offer a substitute under the terms of the special order just adopted?

Mr. MANN. What are the terms of the special order?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the order again.

The Clerk again read the special order.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman from Texas desire to yield the floor now for me to offer the substitute?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do not desire to yield right here unless the reading of the resolution is to be waived, as agreed by us yesterday, having already been printed in the RECORD in parallel columns for the information of Members.

Mr. MANN. There is no objection to waiving the first reading of the resolution.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then there is no objection to the gentleman from Illinois offering his substitute at the present time.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the rules of the House of Representatives of the Sixty-first Congress be adopted as the rules of the House of Representatives for the first or extra session only of the Sixty-second Congress, including the standing orders of March 8 and March 14, 1900 (relating to consideration of pension and claims bills on Friday), which are continued in force during said first session, with the following amendments to said rules of said Sixty-first Congress:

First. That the Speaker be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint the following standing committees and no others (unless he is hereafter specially authorized to appoint other committees by resolution of the House), viz:

The Committee on Ways and Means, on Printing, on Accounts, on Mileage, and on Enrolled Bills.

Second. That section 4 of Rule X be amended to read as follows:

"There shall be a Committee on Rules, to consist of 15 members, who shall be elected by the Members of the House, said committee to elect its own chairman, which committee, when so elected, shall have all the rights, powers, and privileges conferred upon the Committee on Rules by the rules of the House, and in addition to the powers so conferred upon it, it is hereby authorized and directed to revise, amend, simplify, and codify the rules of procedure of the House and report its conclusions to the House of Representatives on the first Monday in December, 1911, which report shall be of the highest privilege and remain so until disposed of by the House. Said committee shall have authority to sit during the session of Congress and in recess, to send for persons and papers, and to take testimony either before the full committee or any subcommittee thereof; that the necessary and actual expenses incurred in carrying out the purpose of this resolution shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House: *Provided*, That said Committee on Rules shall continue to act until said report shall be acted upon by the House."

Mr. MANN. Now, if the gentleman from Texas will pardon the interruption—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. The resolution that I have offered as a substitute is the same resolution that was offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] two years ago.

Mr. FITZGERALD. And which the gentleman from Illinois voted against at the time.

Mr. MANN. And I may do so again; I do not know.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I felt sure that the gentleman from Illinois would make that statement. Now, Mr. Speaker, I will ask the Chair to notify me when I have proceeded 15 minutes. How much time have I already occupied?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has occupied four minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. When I have occupied 20 minutes in all I will ask the Chair to notify me. Mr. Speaker, if I may be allowed to proceed, I will state in a brief way the changes made in the rules and undertake to explain what is proposed in the present code presented by the Committee on Rules.

The first amendment is to Rule X. We here provide for the election of all standing committees. Heretofore those standing committees have been appointed by the Speaker, until otherwise ordered; but we are now meeting the expectations of the American people and conforming to our own judgment, taking that power away from the Speaker of this House, as we promised to do. Therefore, no longer is the Speaker of the House authorized to appoint standing committees, but hereafter during this Congress, and as long as subsequent Congresses may prefer to follow the precedent, you have the right to elect your committees.

We have abolished six of the useless committees, to wit: The Committees on Manufactures, Militia, Private Land Claims, Pacific Railroads, Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, and Ventilation and Acoustics. We also provide for the election of the chairmen of all standing committees and filling vacancies therein by election in this House. We have changed the clause of the old rules in reference to the Committee on Rules and provided that hereafter such committee shall consist of 11 members, of which the Speaker shall not be a member.

The next change is in Rule XI. We have made the necessary changes in order to harmonize it with the amendments of Rule X.

Mr. LONGWORTH rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Ohio?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I must decline to yield at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is for a very brief question.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I must decline to yield until the completion of my statement, and then if I have time will endeavor to answer the question.

The next change is in Rule XIII. There we have provided for the requisite number of calendars of business, and placed under the appropriate heads in this rule the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, the Calendar of Motions to Discharge

Committees, and also provide for the daily printing of calendars. We have also perfected the unanimous-consent rule in order that a Member may have a second opportunity to place his request upon the Unanimous Consent Calendar, and then if that request is denied by objection, after placing it there at his own pleasure, it must go off the calendar and not be again placed thereon.

To Rule XXI we have added what is known as the retrenchment amendment. Some call it the Holman amendment. Mr. Speaker, let me say in passing that if there is any one subject needing attention in this country it is the one appropriating the people's money. Extravagance with the money of the people in the Treasury of the United States is eating into the very vitals of this Republic! Hence we have so amended this rule as to make it possible to cut down appropriations and save millions of public money every year. [Applause.]

We have added an entirely new provision to Rule XXI in reference to revenue bills, and it is perhaps fair that I call attention to the exact verbiage of that provision at this time. That new clause reads:

No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I can not yield now. If I have time after concluding my statement, it will give me pleasure to do so.

Rule XXIV, clause 6, adds an entirely new proposition. It takes the standing orders in regard to pension bills and claim bills and incorporates them in one rule. They will hereafter be known as a part of Rule XXIV. This rule is also changed and rearranges the order of business, and puts it in such form that there is logical sequence.

Rule XXVII, known as the "Calendar of Motion to Discharge," has been materially changed. It is one of the new rules forced from the Republican majority last Congress against their will, and we have largely improved it. It is so important to the House and the country that I may be pardoned for giving a brief analysis of that rule as formulated by its present wording. First, the Calendar of Motion to Discharge is established. It provides that a bill must have been in the appropriate committee for 15 days before the discharge motion can be filed. Next, the calendar is named and called specifically a "Calendar of Motion to Discharge Committees." Again, the motion to discharge must have been entered for 7 days on the motion calendar prior to its being called up. Recognitions must be in the order in which they are filed. Again, a very important change is that a bill shall be read by title only when called up, and the title must contain not over 100 words.

After reading the title, the bill can not be submitted to the House unless a majority, by tellers, so determines. If a second, by tellers, fails, then the motion must go off the calendar and can not be restored. If a second is ordered, debate is limited to 20 minutes, 10 minutes to each side. The motion has precedence over motions to suspend the rules, and must be ordered at this juncture by a majority vote of the House membership. If it prevails, then the bill must be taken from the consideration of the committee and placed upon the proper calendar to which it belongs. And upon the calling of such committee the bill may be called up prior to any bill reported from the same committee subsequent to the discharge of the same. No Member can have on such calendar exceeding two bills at any one time. This is an entirely new provision of the rule. We found it convenient to drop Rule XXVI in rearranging and renumbering certain rules, and that has been done. Whatever was deemed necessary for retention in the rule has been preserved. We changed Rule XXXIII by allowing the Resident Commissioners from the Philippine Islands the privileges of the floor. We slightly changed the verbiage of Rule XXXIV in regard to the Press Gallery, and by specific language have set apart a certain portion thereof for the benefit of the reporters and correspondents. The committee saw proper to abrogate the rule in regard to printing, because that matter is covered by general law.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman perfectly confident about that? That is not a partisan matter in any sense. I have not been able to discover myself any provision of law which provides for the printing as a document of matter referred by a Speaker to a committee. I think there is no such provision.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If the gentleman from Texas will permit.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will state to the gentleman from Illinois that a lot of printing formerly done under orders and rules was done under authority of acts which have been adopted from time to time. The only part of the rule there might be any question about is the first clause, providing that all documents disposed of by reference to committees and otherwise shall be printed.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I do not wish to detain the House except to make this suggestion so gentlemen may look into this. I went over the matter myself, and then I requested the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HINDS] to go over the matter, and neither of us were able to find or did find—I will not say we were not able to find—any provision which would authorize the printing of documents referred from the Speaker's table to a committee, and there may be some question as to whether there would be any authority to print a bill which had been reported or passed.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We can arrange all that by a standing order, and I will say to the House that we conferred with those in charge of the document room and those connected with the Committee on Accounts and others dealing with public printing and they all informed us that the rule is practically obsolete and unnecessary, and therefore we struck it from the provisions of the rules.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of other amendments not necessary to discuss at this time and these have been laid before the House in this brief statement, the chief changes, the material alterations, and we are ready to submit the rules to the judgment of the House and country. The minor changes can be taken up and considered as we proceed.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas yield to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. How much time have I occupied?

The SPEAKER. Eighteen minutes.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if there is any amendment to the old rules or a provision in the proposed rules that will prevent the use of calendar Wednesday by one committee for more than two days? Is there any change of that kind made in the rules?

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman permit?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I do.

Mr. GARRETT. There is not, and it is not necessary, because it is always within the power of the House to prevent that by the question of consideration being raised.

Mr. MADISON. The gentleman remembers that while we had that same power during the last session of Congress, yet every calendar Wednesday was taken up by one bill.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I will answer the gentleman by saying that we have preserved calendar Wednesday, and are sure the Speaker of the House will see that it is wisely administered. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. NORRIS. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question on that particular proposition?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. NORRIS. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that there is no provision, as I read it, in the proposed new rule that will permit the Committee of the Whole, on calendar Wednesday, to limit debate or to prevent anyone speaking in general debate on a bill in the Committee of the Whole on calendar Wednesday about things ulterior and having no connection with the bill under discussion. I want to ask the gentlemen if they considered the proposition of changing that so that calendar Wednesday could not be frittered away as it has been several times before?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We did, and we considered that we could proceed with perfect order and utilize calendar Wednesday as it is in the rule. We think that is covered by the general rules of the House.

Mr. NORRIS. Several times there was general debate on some unimportant bill on calendar Wednesday taking place and consuming the entire day on subjects entirely different and not connected with the bill under debate. I think that has occurred.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We think we went as far as we should have gone at this time.

Mr. LONGWORTH and Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH].

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask the gentleman the purpose of the amendment to paragraph 2 of Rule XI, with regard to the reference of bills to the Committee on Ways and Means. There is the additional language:

Such measures as purport to raise revenue.

What is the purpose of that?

Mr. GARRETT. May I be permitted to say to the gentleman that there are some who hold to the belief that protective tariff bills, laid purely for protection, are not revenue bills and are not constitutional bills. This is the restoration of the language of an old Democratic rule.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it desired to limit the functions of the Ways and Means Committee?

Mr. GARRETT. Not in the least, nor will this do it.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. This will liberalize their functions when they are legislating in behalf of the people.

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota and Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER. To whom does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. BURKE].

Mr. BURKE of South Dakota. As to Rule XXIV, paragraph 6, I would like the gentleman to tell the House how a bill on the Private Calendar, reported from some committee other than the committees named in the paragraph, can be considered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We will discuss that when we get to it seriatim. I can not yield any further.

Permit me to say, in conclusion, that we have so amended these rules as to confer on every Member his privileges under the Constitution of the United States to legislate in behalf of his constituents, and if this body is not a deliberative forum, as intended by its founders, the Committee on Rules, in so far as they are concerned, will be willing and prompt to hear suggestions and write the rules as they should be, in accordance with principles of wisdom and right. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from Texas to paragraph 2 in Rule XXI, which is known as the Holman rule. Has the gentleman got the paragraph before him?

Mr. MANN. He has it in his head.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. We are going to get to that and discuss it presently.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Now, that rule states what classes of amendments and what classes of provisions shall be in order on general appropriation bills. The rule states that new legislation shall be in order, provided it retrenches expenditures and is germane.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman suspend until I can make an inquiry of the gentleman from Illinois? Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts from his time?

Mr. MANN. I yield one minute, Mr. Speaker. If the gentleman desires more time, I will yield to him two minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. It will take several minutes to discuss this question.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] just stated that he would consider these various items seriatim when he reached them. May I ask the gentleman from Texas when that will be? Will it be to-day, or will it be after the rules are adopted?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. No. I meant to say that there would be Members of the House who would take up the various features of the rules and discuss them.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I would like three minutes in which to raise this question now.

Mr. MANN. Would not the gentleman prefer to wait until the gentlemen who are to discuss that rule have discussed it?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I think it would be well to discuss it now, because I think it is a matter which ought to be looked into.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The SPEAKER. Before the gentleman from Massachusetts proceeds, I would like to suggest to Members that they will aid the Chair very much in keeping order if they will observe the rule that they address the Chair first when they want to interrupt a Member who has the floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The gentleman from Texas will find that on line 6, paragraph 2, Rule XXI, page 22, there is a provision quoted verbatim from the old Holman rule—

Nor shall any such provision in any such bill or amendment thereto be in order—

unless certain requirements are met. Now, does that word "provision" qualify the word "bill" and the word "amendment," both, or does it only qualify the word "bill"? It is a very important question.

Mr. MANN. There being no answer forthcoming—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I am willing to give an answer. Giving my individual judgment, I think it would qualify the bill and amendment, both. The Speaker can place his construction on it. I have not the right to construe the language for him, but the language can speak for itself.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. The reason I raise this question is because in the past this provision caused very much confusion. The House before voting ought to know what it means.

If the gentlemen will look up Crutchfield's Digest, which was prepared by order of the Congress that adopted these rules, he will find that in the first session of the Fifty-first Congress a situation arose in which Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, held an amendment in order in direct opposition to the views just expressed by the gentleman from Texas. The Post Office bill appropriated \$450,000 for rural free delivery. An amendment was offered reducing that amount to \$449,000, and providing likewise that no rural routes should be established except under specified methods. Now, it is true that that amendment reduced the appropriation, but the all-important part of the amendment introduced changes in existing law which had nothing to do with retrenchment. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole held that under the reading of that rule, although the amendment might produce changes in the existing law not contemplated by the spirit of the Holman rule, yet merely because one part of the amendment nominally reduced the appropriation, therefore the whole must be held in order, even though the important clause in no way related to retrenchment. Mr. Crutchfield, the Democratic parliamentarian, suggests possible modifications, so that the rule may be made clearer. Mr. Buchanan's decision and later decisions of like tenor have given this rule just the opposite construction to that which the gentleman from Texas has just given us.

I call the attention of this House to the fact that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] says that the Speaker or the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole will decide this matter. I will try to point out that any Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, unless guided by the interpretation which the gentleman from Texas has just given, would be constrained to construe the rule according to the ruling of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole, Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, and the similar rulings of his successors. But inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has given us his interpretation—

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I regret that I can not yield. I say, inasmuch as the chairman of the Committee on Rules has given to the House his present interpretation of that clause, this fact would seem to be worthy of weight as an opinion overruling the decision rendered by the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Buchanan.

Mr. MANN. I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, at the commencement of our business to-day the Speaker said that no more important business was ever presented to a House than the consideration and adoption of its rules. I venture to say that never in the history of the American Congress has any House heretofore attempted to adopt a code of rules without giving to every Member of the House an opportunity to offer an amendment to those rules.

This is not the adoption of a code of rules by a party that has been in power for a number of years, as the Republican Party has, but it is the adoption of a new code of rules by a party new to power. It is substantially, in all respects, a revision of the House rules.

Heretofore on several occasions there have been important revisions of the rules. The rules were revised in 1880 upon a report from the Committee on Rules, which at that time consisted of several very distinguished men, Mr. Randall of Pennsylvania, Mr. Stephens of Georgia, Mr. Blackburn of Kentucky, Mr. Garfield of Ohio, and Mr. Frye of Maine. Those rules were carefully considered by that committee of distinguished men, who represented both the majority and minority parties, and when presented to the House were accompanied by a written report. There is no written report accompanying this code of rules. Week after week was spent in deliberating upon those rules in 1880, and opportunity was afforded to every Member of that House to present such amendments as he saw fit to present, to any and every one of those rules.

The rules were revised again in 1890, and the Committee on Rules at that time was made up of men whose names are distinguished in our history. It consisted of Thomas B. Reed, William McKinley, JOSEPH G. CANNON, John G. Carlisle, and Roger Q. Mills. Those rules were carefully deliberated upon, and after long consideration by the committee were presented to the House, accompanied by a written report. Then they were debated day in and day out, and every Member of the House of Representatives at that time was afforded an opportunity to offer amendments to the rules. It was recognized then that every man on either side of the House, whatever might be his political faith, had an interest in the establishment of wise rules for the government of the House of Representatives.

There was another revision of the rules in the Fifty-second Congress, when the Democratic Party came into power. The chairman of the Committee on Rules at that time was the Speaker, Mr. Crisp. Mr. Outhwaite, of Ohio, was on the committee; Mr. Catchings, of Mississippi, was on the committee, all distinguished men in our parliamentary history; and on that occasion the rules were considered and deliberated upon over a great length of time by the committee and presented to the House, accompanied by a written report. A resolution was adopted that the rules should be read seriatim and due opportunity given to every Member of the House to consider the rules and to offer amendments.

So that on every occasion heretofore when there has been a revision of the rules an opportunity has been afforded to Members of the House to offer amendments, to debate, and consider and come to a conclusion as to what should be proper rules for the government of the House.

Mr. BARTLETT. May I interrupt the gentleman?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. BARTLETT. Does the gentleman recall what was done in the Fifty-fourth Congress with reference to the adoption of the rules? I think we had three days of consideration then.

Mr. DALZELL. I recall very distinctly what was done in the Fifty-fourth Congress. I happened to be a member of the Committee on Rules, with Mr. Henderson, subsequently Speaker, and on that occasion, as to every single rule in the code of rules, an opportunity was offered for amendment. I do not recall whether we had any lengthy general debate, but general debate on the rules amounts to nothing. Why should you have general debate if you can not offer an amendment? Why theorize about what might be if we know that it can not be?

Mr. POUL. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. DALZELL. I do.

Mr. POUL. I would like the gentleman to tell us when it was from that day down to this that the minority have had an opportunity to offer amendments to the various paragraphs of the rules of the House, or even so much as an opportunity to offer a substitute? We have had the gag put on us every time at the opening of every Congress.

Mr. DALZELL. Well, you gentlemen seem to have learned how to do it pretty well. [Laughter.] I have drawn a distinction between the adoption of the rules by a party that has been continuously in power and has been acting under rules that it originally adopted after consideration by both sides of the House and a party that has just come into power and proposes to introduce a new code of rules.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania yield to the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman explain why that distinction is of any value to the minority or to the new Members of the House? Why in the Fifty-eighth Congress, when I was a new Member, was not I just as much entitled to the privilege of amending the rules as if there had been a change of parties?

Mr. DALZELL. The rules that were then adopted had been discussed originally by the members of the gentleman's party and had been in force for many years. There is no analogy between that case and this at all. Here is a proposition—

Mr. SHERLEY. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania does not wish to yield further, I will not annoy him.

Mr. DALZELL. I thought I had pointed out the distinction that exists in my mind.

Mr. SHERLEY. If that is the gentleman's full answer, then I am content.

Mr. DALZELL. The proposition under which we are acting to-day is that after the reading of the resolution—and, by the way, the rules are offered as a single proposition en bloc—after

the reading of the proposition the minority is entitled to offer a substitute, and then after four hours of general debate, which means nothing, because in general debate we can do nothing more than theorize, the gentlemen on the other side defending their position and we on our side defending our position, but no amendment can be offered, and then at the close of that useless general debate a vote is to be taken. How? "Without delay or intervening motion."

Now, there is adopted in this order one of the most drastic phrases of any of the rules that have heretofore been adopted in this House by either the Republican or the Democratic Party, and which is in violation of one of the provisions of the majority's own code of rule, to the effect that even the Committee on Rules can report no proposition that shall exclude a motion to recommit.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What would be the use of a motion to recommit if there is no committee to send it to, no committee of the House?

Mr. MANN. We might recommit it to the Democratic caucus.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That might not have been bad if you had done it previously.

Mr. MANN. It could not have made it any worse.

Mr. DALZELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I have no disposition to engage in general debate on this proposition. I do not care to discuss Republican theories or Democratic theories with respect to the rules, nor do I care to go into in detail the various amendments that have been made, that are proposed to be made, to the rules of the Sixty-first Congress by the code of rules now offered. Every material thing in the code of rules now offered that is of any advantage or of any value has been copied into those rules from the rules of the Republican Party. [Applause on the Republican side.] There is not a single new thing in the code of rules now offered—

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. What about Rule X? Did the Republicans put that in? And now, if they are so good, why are you not all willing to vote for them?

Mr. DALZELL. I think, except in some particulars, they are a pretty good code of rules.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then I hope the gentleman's side will vote for them.

Mr. DALZELL. I think the gentleman will be disappointed in his hope; not that I would not like to be in his company, but at this time I am afraid I cannot be.

Now, the fundamental change in the rules is embodied in Rule X and Rule XI—that is to say, in taking away from the House the opportunity to have the appointment of committees through the medium of the Speaker. Under the Republican rules—because the rules of the Sixty-first Congress were Republican rules—the language was "unless especially ordered by the House the Speaker should appoint the committees." The language of these proposed rules is that there "shall be elected by the House at the commencement of each Congress the following standing committees," and so forth.

So far as the question of electing committees, instead of selecting committees by the Speaker is concerned. I do not propose now to discuss that question. Assuming that the gentlemen on the other side of the House were justified in selecting their committees in the manner in which they have selected them, there is no possible justification for their having added Members to the majority side of these committees without adding any to the minority side of the committees.

I shall leave the discussion of that question to some of the gentlemen who shall follow me.

I think, so far as the provision of these rules is concerned with respect to the appointment of select committees, that it is an improvement on the rules of the Sixty-first Congress. That provision restores a clause that was in the rules of the House from the beginning of the Government up until 1880, which for some reason or other was omitted when the rules were then revised. It reserves to the House, in other words, the right to do as it pleases with respect to select committees and to conference committees, but I see no reason why there should have been taken away from the Members of the committees the right to select their chairman.

In this respect this rule is in one particular in direct violation of the rule adopted at the last Congress, when a Committee on Rules was provided for, because the provision there was that that committee should elect its own chairman. The language is:

And in case of a permanent vacancy in the chairmanship of any such committee the House shall elect another chairman.

That is, as I say, in direct violation of the terms of the rule adopted at the last Congress when the Committee on Rules was created and power given to it to elect its own chairman.

Mr. GARRETT. That is, of course, a change as to the Committee on Rules; but does not the gentleman think it is a consistent change, that it is consistent with the general principle that the committee was seeking to lay down?

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, well, perhaps it is. I have no criticism to make on the ground of consistency.

In the provision for preferential reports, reports of committees which have a preference in the right to report, the present code of rules follows the rules of the Sixty-first Congress in striking out what was in the rules of the Fifty-third Congress, namely, the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, and also follows the rules of the Sixty-first Congress in providing a preference for the Committee on Territories and for the Committee on Pensions.

Now, if I would make any criticism on that, it would be that, while good reason existed for striking out the Committee on Banking and Currency and the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, because they were made preferential committees in the first place, during the free silver period, I think the same logic that justified that action would justify the restoration of the Committee on Banking and Currency at this time, in view of the fact that we have an existing Monetary Commission and that the probabilities are, if not in the immediate, at least within the near future, Congress will have to deal with questions of currency.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is that upon the theory that the Monetary Commission is likely to report proposed legislation?

Mr. DALZELL. I said, if not in the immediate, within the near future.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman seriously propose that a Democratic Congress should make privileged bills coming from a Republican Monetary Commission?

Mr. DALZELL. I was not undertaking to judge the action of the Democrats at all, either charitably or uncharitably.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman has that impression, it is no doubt based on the recent action of the minority with reference to the reciprocity treaty.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman, I understand, is facetious and not serious in that suggestion.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, aside from the question of selecting committees, the only material change, in my judgment—the only serious change, in my judgment—made in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress is in Rule XXI, section 2, by the adoption of what is known as the Holman amendment. I can not, in view of the parliamentary history of this country, do otherwise than regard that as a most dangerous innovation in the rules of the House. In order that the House may thoroughly understand what that is, let me take the time to read it. As that clause appears in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress it is as follows:

No appropriation shall be recorded in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress.

Now, that is the existing rule. That has been the rule ever since the Forty-ninth Congress, with an exception. It was the rule in the Forty-ninth Congress, which was Democratic, and the rule in the Fiftieth, which was Democratic, both presided over by Speaker Carlisle, but not the rule, as I recollect now, in the Fifty-second and Fifty-third, which adopted the Holman amendment. Now, the Holman amendment is this:

Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order, except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

Now, that is a provision for legislation on appropriation bills. That is a provision for legislating by the Appropriations Committee. That is a provision which renders useless and unnecessary any other committee of the House. That is a provision which turns over to the Committee on Appropriations all the powers of all the other committees of the House of Representatives. It is wrong in theory, because, in the first place, the Committee on Appropriations ought not to legislate, for the reason that the other branch of Congress is entitled to have an appropriation bill not containing legislation which they have not considered; and, secondly, because the President of the United States is entitled to have an appropriation bill that does not require consideration at his hands of legislation. It is wrong in theory, furthermore, because it is a usurpation of

the rights of every other committee and of the jurisdiction of every other committee in the House of Representatives. Now let me call your attention to this rule, or rather to this amendment to the rules.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has expired.

Mr. MANN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, the rule, without the Holman amendment, was in operation until 1876, when the Holman amendment was adopted, and it remained in operation from 1876 until 1880, until the adoption of the rules in the first session of the Fifty-ninth Congress. I want to show you what kind of legislation resulted from the operation of that rule. On February 5, 1879, an extensive scheme of legislation for the reorganization of the Army was admitted as an amendment to the Army appropriation bill on the discovery by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that the general effect would be to reduce appropriations.

Think of that. A reorganization of the Army put on an appropriation bill upon proof being made to the satisfaction of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that on the whole it would reduce expenditures. Why, my friends, you take the sundry civil appropriation bill that deals with every single department of the Government, that touches the Government in every vital spot, and under this rule the Committee on Appropriations can legislate for every department, for every bureau, for every question that the Government may be directly interested in. Again, on February 19, 1879, an amendment to repeal a portion of the Federal election law was admitted upon discovery by the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole that it would be a retrenchment of expenditures. On May 18, 1880, an amendment providing for free seed distribution was admitted to the agricultural appropriation bill without a question of order, the wording being so arranged as to reduce the appropriation \$80,000 to \$79,000. The extent to which legislation was placed on appropriation bills at that time was illustrated on July 27, 1882, the naval appropriation bill being before the Senate, when Mr. John Sherman, of Ohio, deplored the change which the bill had made in its rule to prevent legislation on appropriation bills, and said of the pending bill:

Here is a bill 40 pages long passed at the heel of the session. It is sent to us. I will say that three-fourths of this bill contains matter either of a mere recitative character or is general legislation affecting the whole organization of the Navy from beginning to end.

Now, then, in the revision of 1880 the Committee on Rules, with John G. Carlisle, Samuel J. Randall, Mr. Morrison, of Illinois, Thomas B. Reed, Mr. Hiscock, of New York, not only reported against the readoption of that rule, but they denounced it in the most strenuous terms, and on the floor of this House—

Mr. BUTLER. What Congress was that?

Mr. DALZELL. That was the Forty-ninth Congress.

Mr. BUTLER. Democratic?

Mr. DALZELL. A Democratic Congress.

On the floor of the House it was denounced by Roger Q. Mills, of Texas; by Mr. Dockery, of Missouri; by Mr. Sayres, of Texas; by Mr. Springer, of Illinois; by Mr. Bland, of Missouri, all distinguished Democrats, and by every prominent Democrat whose name is historical in the life of that Congress. And yet you gentlemen come here to-day and, in view of the legislative history of that bill, and in view of its denunciations by these great Democrats, undertake to force upon the minority a rule which, instead of reducing expenditures, which, instead of being in the interests of economy, is likely to increase the expenditures and to put upon the statute books legislation that otherwise could not get there. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. DALZELL. Yes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's time has again expired.

Mr. DALZELL. Then, of course, I can not yield.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POU]. [Applause.]

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a strange and an unusual note from that side of the Chamber to-day. Our friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] complains that the Republican side of this Chamber has not the privilege to offer amendments to these rules, paragraph by paragraph. The rule provides that a substitute may be offered, but he complains that that is not enough. He wants opportunity to amend these rules section by section. This is rather an unusual demand from that side of the Chamber, in the light of the history of the past 10 years. For five successive Congresses, and even longer, I and other

Members have sat in our seats here and had a code of rules offered to us, with no other privilege than that of voting for or against the entire code offered by the Republican side of this Chamber. We were not only not allowed to offer amendments in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, but, so far as I now recollect, we were not even accorded the privilege of offering a substitute, and often you adopted your rules almost without debate, and now the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] makes this novel argument. Because in 1894 the rules of the House were considered for some 6 or 8 weeks, and because there was ample opportunity for debate 17 years ago, and because the rules were then amended as the Fifty-fourth Congress deemed proper, there has been no necessity for amending the rules in the same manner at any time since then until the opposite party came into power. The gentleman from Pennsylvania complains now that the minority, of which he is a member, is not permitted under the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas to amend the code of rules offered by this side of the Chamber, rule by rule, paragraph by paragraph.

Now, let us consider for a moment how the Democratic majority in this Chamber is proposing to consider the rules offered for the government of the House. In the first place, let it not be forgotten that ample time is allowed for general debate. If that side of the Chamber had insisted upon even longer time for general debate, you could have gotten it. You were allowed to offer any substitute upon which you can agree among yourselves.

How did you treat us when you were in power? Usually you adopted the rules of the preceding Congress, with little or no opportunity for debate, with no opportunity for amendment in the manner suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and, so far as I now recollect, without the privilege of offering a substitute. We simply had to vote "aye" or "no" on the adoption of the Reed rules. That was the treatment accorded to the minority for years by the Republican majority in this Chamber. For 17 years we have been told over and over again that the Reed rules were about as near perfect as any code of rules could be made. You on that side of the Chamber considered them so nearly perfect that you felt justified in presenting them time and again to this House and forcing Members to vote "aye" or "no," without opportunity at any time to offer amendments or even a substitute. What is the matter with that side of the Chamber to-day? If your Reed rules have been perfect for 17 years, are they not perfect to-day? Are they any less perfect now than they have been during all the years when you forced their adoption, often without debate and never with privilege to amend?

In the rules offered to-day we have taken away from the Speaker the power to name the committees of the House.

Will you gentlemen vote to give that power back to the Speaker? We have written in our rules a provision that the Speaker shall not be a member of the Committee on Rules. Do you gentlemen desire to change that? Do you want to vote for the old rule allowing the Speaker to make up a Rules Committee of five with himself as chairman? Why do you not stand by these perfect rules under which you have been running the House? Are you ready to restore to the Speaker that power which so long made it necessary for the individual Member to go to him privately, get on his knees, and beg for the privilege of being recognized on the floor in order to ask for unanimous consent? Why do you not offer your perfect code of rules as a substitute for the rules offered by the gentleman from Texas? Are those rules so bad that no one can be found on that side of the Chamber who is willing to offer them as a substitute for the rules now under consideration? Has it come to pass that the rules which governed the House for nearly two decades are without a single friend on this floor? Every change which has been made, Mr. Speaker, is in the direction of limiting the power of the Speaker and restoring to the individual membership of this House rights and privileges which never should have been taken away.

You gentlemen pursued your policy of centralization of power until you made the American House of Representatives well-nigh the laughingstock in the eyes of the world. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts rose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ALEXANDER). Will the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POU. For a brief question.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Are the rules in respect to centralization in the Sixty-first Congress any different from the rules of the Fifty-third Congress which the gentleman has used as a model? I mean the Democratic rules.

Mr. POUL. I do not know exactly to what the gentleman refers.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I mean with reference to a Member going to the Speaker on his knees for unanimous consent, and the Speaker having the power to grant it.

Mr. POUL. Nobody now has to go to the Speaker begging for unanimous consent unless he wants to do so.

Mr. MANN. Both of these gentlemen voted against the rules.

Mr. MADISON. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. POUL. For a question.

Mr. MADISON. Is it not true that under the rules as now proposed, that upon the matter of the suspension of the rules, if any Member here under the rules, as you propose them, desires to make a motion to suspend the rules, he has to go to the Speaker in his chamber and ask for recognition?

Mr. POUL. You have a perfect right to ask it right here on the floor.

Mr. MADISON. I will ask the gentleman if there is any modification whatever in the rules of the Sixty-first Congress as to that matter, and if it is not true that under those rules and the rulings made by a Democratic Speaker that you have still got to go to the Speaker's chamber and make arrangements in advance for recognition for a suspension of the rules?

Mr. POUL. Not at all, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. It is done out in the open under a Democratic Speaker and administration of the House. [Laughter.]

Mr. POUL. And, Mr. Speaker, a Democratic Speaker would not abuse that privilege, anyway. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not care to yield further. I submit again the proposition stated in the beginning, that every change recommended—and you gentlemen know it to be so—has been toward limiting the power of the Speaker and enlarging the power of the individual Members of this House.

Now, there has been a good deal said with respect to Rule XXI and with respect to Rule XXVIII, which provides for the discharge of committees of the House. We do not contend that these rules are perfect. We do contend, though, that they both are better than the old rules. If a fair trial shall prove that these rules do not work well, they can and will no doubt be amended. Now, I want to say this: If gentlemen propose deliberately to go about it to make Rule XXVIII a farce, when it was intended to confer upon individual Members larger powers, possibly they can to some extent succeed. If gentlemen deliberately plan and scheme to nullify the laudable purpose of this rule, it is possible, I say, they may partially succeed; and that can be said of other rules as well. Any man who sets out to obstruct legislation can do a great deal along that line. We all know that, but we have improved Rule XXVIII in several respects, we think, and if necessity shall develop, it can be still further amended.

The same may be said with respect to the criticism of Rule XXI, which is among the most important changes we have made. The rule provides two things—first, that a proposition which changes existing law shall be germane; second, that its effect shall be to retrench and economize. Those two requirements must be met, but if revolutionary measures are offered under cover of this rule, if it shall be found that there are real dangers of abuse, the Committee on Rules will, I am sure, take such action as may be deemed wise and necessary; but I do not believe there is basis for the criticism of this rule.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield a minute there?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from North Carolina yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts?

Mr. POUL. I do.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. I understand a ruling was made on this provision in the Fifty-second Congress and at various other times. An amendment was offered to the post-office appropriation bill which nominally reduced the amount of the gross appropriations. With that same amendment there was incorporated a totally different provision, totally changing existing law in a way not contemplated by the spirit of the Holman rule. Yet, as that rule was then interpreted by Mr. Buchanan, of Virginia, chairman of the Committee of the Whole House, and as it was subsequently held on other occasions, such amendments were held in order merely because they reduced the gross amount of an appropriation, irrespective of what else they might do.

Mr. POUL. Now, Mr. Speaker, I can not yield further. The gentleman is making a speech in my time. I do not believe there is basis for fears expressed as to the abuse of this rule, but if experience shall show that the purpose of the rule can be perverted in the manner suggested we will simply have to amend that rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. POUL. Just a word more, Mr. Speaker. I am sorry that so much of my time has been taken up by interruptions.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield a minute more to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. POUL. The Committee on Rules, Mr. Speaker, has made an honest effort to revise these rules in a way that will, in a proper manner, enlarge the powers of the individual membership of this House. If it shall develop that further amendments are necessary, the committee will not stand for the policy of stifling legislation demanded by the people, and in so far as it has the power, it will aid in restoring to each Member every right he is entitled to exercise and enjoy in this Chamber. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say this: No code of rules which ever will be adopted by this House will be perfect. We claim that the rules offered by the gentleman from Texas, who will be chairman of the Committee on Rules, are better by far than the code of rules under which the House has been working for years.

Reforms begun have not been abandoned. There has been no step backward. The right of the Member to request unanimous consent for the present consideration of any measure in which he is interested is enlarged by the provision allowing him to reinstate his measure a second time. Several useless committees have been abolished and other changes made which will result in a saving of many thousands of dollars; and I want to repeat, if other changes shall become necessary to restore to every Member every right to which he ought to be entitled under the Constitution, the committee will not turn a deaf ear to any reasonable suggestion. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. MANN. I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. [Applause.]

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. Speaker, I have been one of those who have always believed that the question of rules for the government of the House was not a partisan proposition. I have always thought we ought to adopt rules for the government of this body without taking into consideration which political party was in control of it. I ought to demand the same rules for my government and my control as a Member of this House when my political opponents are in the majority that I insist upon for myself when my own political party is in control.

I want to discuss briefly the proposed rules, now before the House, and to suggest to the House some amendments that I believe will appeal to every man, regardless of his political affiliations, if he believes in fair play and good legislation, and likewise believes in remedying the defects that have been developed in the past under our rules.

I regret that we are placed in such a parliamentary situation here that while we can talk and talk and talk we are not allowed to offer amendments and to vote. One of the greatest prerogatives of Members of this House is to be permitted to vote upon propositions material to our people and upon propositions material to the control of our own body.

Now, to begin with, I want to say that some of the amendments to the old rules that are proposed in this schedule of rules now before us are, in my judgment, good ones and amendments that I would gladly support. At the same time the first one that I am going to mention, I believe, does not give, in place of the old rule, as good a remedy for what I believe to be the acknowledged defects of the old rule as we could get if no man's hands were tied by a caucus and every man voted as he felt and not as he feared.

These rules provide that the committees of the House of Representatives shall be selected by the House. It takes away from the Speaker the power of appointing the standing committees. That particular principle of taking from the Speaker the power to appoint the standing committees of the House is something that a good many of us over here on this side have stood for, worked for, and almost died for for the last two or three years. As far as you go in taking that power away from the Speaker you have done well and are entitled to praise, but you put down the gag rule then and say that the method that you provide in its place shall not be amended. You tie every man's hands and refuse to allow any amendments to be offered. You let us talk, but deprive us of the right to offer or vote upon amendments.

If I had had the opportunity, I would have offered an amendment that in substance is the same as the original amendment that was offered here on the 17th day of March a year ago last month, and for which many of us over here stand. I realize that this particular amendment could not prevail, because you are tied up by caucus action, and I believe that all the amend-

ments that I am going to suggest would prevail if every man here was free. I believe that there is a majority of Members here who believe in it, and that it would bring the proper relief, so that we ought to have had the right to offer it and to vote upon it. The right to vote is much more precious than the right to discuss. On page 6 of the pamphlet containing these rules I would offer an amendment as follows:

Strike out the first paragraph of Rule X and insert in lieu thereof the following: "The standing committees of the House shall be selected by the Committee on Rules, which committee shall consist of 15 members, 9 of whom shall be members of the majority party and 6 of whom shall be members of the minority party or parties, to be selected as follows: The States of the Union shall be divided by a committee of three, appointed by the Speaker for that purpose, into nine groups, each group containing as near as may be an equal number of members belonging to the majority party. The States of the Union shall likewise be divided into six groups, each group containing as near as may be an equal number of members belonging to the minority party or parties. At 10 o'clock a. m. of the day following the adoption of the report of said committee each of the said groups shall meet and select one of its number a member of the Committee on Rules. The place of meeting for each of said groups shall be designated by said committee of three in its report. Each of said groups shall report to the House the name of the member selected for membership on the Committee on Rules. Each standing committee shall elect its own chairman. The Speaker shall not be eligible to membership on any standing committee. The following shall be the standing committees of the House, namely."

Mr. GARRETT and Mr. SHERLEY rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Nebraska yield?

Mr. NORRIS. I yield first to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Does not the gentleman think it would be very bad policy to put into the rules and continue in the rules a proposition of majority and minority parties?

Mr. NORRIS. I want to say to the gentleman, as I have already said, that I firmly believe, and there are a good many others that think with me, that that particular change in the rules would bring the greatest possible relief and provide a very good way for the selection of committees. As I said before, I do not expect this to carry, but we ought to have had the right to go on record for what we believe, and conscientiously believe, to be the best remedy for this situation. Having said that much about it, unless I can be afforded further time I hope gentlemen will not take my time on this amendment, because I have others that I want to discuss.

Mr. JAMES. Will the gentleman yield for one question right there?

Mr. NORRIS. If I had the time, I would be glad to. The objection to the method of selecting committees provided in this schedule of rules is, as I look at it, that it results in caucus selection of committees. I believe the amendment I have suggested would obviate that. I believe we ought to get away from the caucus just as much and just as often and just as far as we can. I believe the time is not far distant when the progressive, patriotic sentiment of the American people will drive the caucus and the political boss and the political machine out of business.

Now, I want to suggest another amendment on page 9 of this pamphlet, and I would like to have the membership follow me, because I am satisfied these amendments will meet with the approval of a vast majority here if they will consider them. At the end of clause 4, Rule X, add a new paragraph, as follows:

No Member shall be eligible to serve at the same time on more than one of the following standing committees: Appropriations, the Judiciary, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Agriculture, the Post Office and Post Roads, and Ways and Means.

Now, I have no objection to adding other committees to this list, if there would be an opportunity here to offer an amendment. I would not confine it myself to those particular committees, but, as far as these committees are concerned, it ought to appeal to every man who has been in the House of Representatives for any length of time that there are two reasons why no Member should serve at the same time on two of these committees. First, it is not just to the other Members who are deprived of the privilege and who are not allowed to serve on any of those important committees; and, second, it is not fair to the House and the country, because a Member can not perform the duties properly as a Representative if he is liable to be called, for instance, by the Ways and Means Committee and the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on very important matters for consideration at the same hour.

Members will realize that I will not be able to discuss in detail all of the benefits that would come from that rule and some others that I will offer, because my time is too limited.

On page 5 of this pamphlet I would like to offer an amendment as follows:

After section 5, Rule X, add a new section, as follows:

"SEC. 6. The Speaker shall not be eligible to serve on any standing committee."

I am not going to discuss that, because I want to go on with some other amendments that I would like to propose; but I think the justice of that will appeal to every Member of the House.

If I were not prevented by this caucus gag I would offer the following amendment:

On page 13, after paragraph 57, Rule XI, add a new paragraph, as follows:

"Unless otherwise ordered by the committee, the business and records of all committees shall be public, and the record of a vote to go into executive session shall be public."

I am satisfied that much of the criticism that has come—some of it justly and some of it unjustly—against the House of Representatives has been because there have been too many executive sessions of committees. We ought to open the door and give the light of publicity full sway in the committee room as we do here on the floor of the House. Every man knows that it is out of order on the floor of the House for a Member to state what took place behind closed doors in the committee.

The public—the press—are not able to get the information, and naturally there is a suspicion, in many cases, perhaps, a wrong impression goes out. It may be in many instances that it is necessary to have a secret meeting. I can imagine such conditions might arise, but we ought to at least reverse the present rule, and instead of making the presumption true that all the business must be secret unless otherwise ordered, we ought to make it public unless the members of the committee are ready to go on record and say that it is of such nature that it ought to be private. Publicity will not injure any honest attempt at legislation, and we all know many meritorious bills are secretly killed in the committee room, and the country is not able to locate the responsibility.

Now, I would like to offer on page 28 of this pamphlet the following amendment, and this refers to calendar Wednesday, a subject that was called up just a while ago in debate by my friend the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON]. After the word "Union," in line 11, paragraph 7 of Rule XXIV, insert the following:

And in considering any such bill before the Committee of the Whole House all general debate shall be confined to the bill under consideration, and the said committee shall have the power to limit and to close such general debate.

Under the rule as brought in here and as it existed in the last Congress, the Committee of the Whole House can not close general debate, and we all know, those of us who were here in the last Congress, that there were instances when men got the floor under general debate on calendar Wednesday and consumed the entire time discussing something that was not before the committee, and the committee was helpless to limit general debate or to close it. To do that, it was compelled to go back into the House and get action by the House. No man would vote against this amendment if King Caucus would only unfasten the fetters.

I would like to have offered on page 30 of this code of rules the following amendment:

At the end of paragraph 1, Rule XXVII, add the following:

The Speaker shall not entertain any motion to suspend the rules unless such motion or the substance or notice thereof shall be printed on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent on the day when such motion is entertained."

Now, the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] said that the object of these proposed rules was to lessen the power of the Speaker and increase the power of the Member. Under the rule, the same as it existed before and as you have repeated it in the proposed code, the Speaker is absolutely in control on suspension day. He is absolutely supreme. He can recognize or not recognize as he sees fit.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield three minutes more to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. NORRIS. The Speaker need not recognize a Member, and no Member is entitled to recognition under this rule unless the Speaker desires to give it to him. Now, I do not seek to take that power away. If I had my way about it, I would take it away altogether; but I wanted to make this change moderate, so it would have no doubt in passing, and therefore I only provided that notice must be given to the House so that it will be published on the calendar and the Members of the House may know what is coming up under suspension. There is no way now, under this Democratic caucus proposed rule, of finding out what it is. The Speaker and the man he is going to recognize carry it in their breasts. We will sit here all day and never know what the next motion to suspend the rules is going to be unless one of these men tells us. Why would it not be reasonable and fair to put on the calendar a notice of this motion, the same as must be done with all bills reported from

committees. If this wonderful power on suspension day is to be vested in the Speaker, why not require that notice to the membership shall be given as to what bills the Speaker is going to have taken up?

I want to refer briefly now, in conclusion, because I have not the time to discuss these questions as I would like to, to the parliamentary situation as it exists at the present time. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POW] said he wanted to enlarge the power of the individual, and yet this very rule you have brought in here and have adopted by a party vote cuts off the right of every individual Member here to offer amendments to these rules, something I must serve under, something you must serve under, and the country must live under for the next two years. I want to say that you are not practicing what you preach. [Applause on Republican side.] You ought to have permitted amendments to be offered here. I do not care whether in the past some Republican majority has been that tyrannical or not. I never have stood for it. I never believed in a gag rule from my own party, and I want to say that it does not taste any better when it comes from the other party. [Applause on Republican side.] It seems to me you have given us an exhibition here of just what you have claimed you were going to avoid. We ought to have had the right to offer amendments here in good faith. These rules must govern me just the same as they must govern you, and I want to say that you can not justify yourself by saying that Republicans did the same thing some other time.

I have heard that argument and excuse made many times on both sides of this House. I have heard Republicans justify their application of the gag by referring to equally drastic gags applied by the Democrats, and to-day we find the Democrats citing Republican precedent. In neither case is the argument either good or logical. Democratic sin will not justify Republican wickedness and Republican tyranny will not excuse Democratic coercion. Instead of seeing if we can not be as bad as our opponents have been we should bend our energies and ambitions toward improvement. The people will not be satisfied when we tell them we were no worse than someone else has been. Instead of imitating what is wrong we should try to improve and stand for what is right. I have refused, when my party was in control of the House, to surrender my convictions at the behest of King Caucus, and I decline to-day to submit my hands to his shackles when he comes in the guise of a Democrat. There ought to be no caucuses on matters of legislation. You know these amendments I have proposed to-day would be adopted if your hands were not shackled and every man was allowed to follow the dictates of his own conscience. Many of you men on the Democratic side, and nearly all of your newspapers, condemned Republican Party machine methods. There are some of us over here who came out in the open, and at the expense of political punishment and the surrender of political patronage, fought those same methods and that same machine. That machine to-day seems to be on the Democratic side of the aisle. King Caucus seems to be there in control, and if you surrender your consciences to him you will be in as great a political slavery as though you were ruled by a czar on the Speaker's throne. When my party was in power I stood here in my place and denounced rules that came in from this side and said then that we could not afford to back up our action by saying that Democrats had done the same thing some time before; and that applies to you to-day. It ought to be nonpartisan. We ought not to tie ourselves up here with a gag rule and by a caucus. You are not elected here to serve a caucus. A caucus nine times out of ten means only that 51 men shall compel 50 men to do what they do not want to do and do not believe in. It means that a majority of a majority will control the House, which often will be a minority of the House.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY].

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have listened very attentively to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS]. He talks well and intelligently, as he always does, and yet, when you sum it up, he has arraigned not the tentative rules of this House, but the caucus. Now, I would say to the gentleman from Nebraska, there are caucuses and caucuses. A caucus can be a dog and cat fight and a caucus can be a friendly conference of conceding brethren. It depends upon whether it was held on last Saturday or the Monday following. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This caucus action is nothing more or less than a unanimous statement of the Democratic membership of this House to the country of the concurrent views of men willing to concede to their brothers. The rules of this House will find in their

last analysis no more perfect defense than the fact that when for the first time in eight long years, to my knowledge, an opportunity was given to the minority party to offer a substitute, which substitute could have cured all the ills of which you complain, no such substitute was offered.

These gentlemen have arraigned against particular flaws against this or that or the other provision of these new rules. Is it true, gentlemen, that your objections are captious, ill-considered, extemporized on the spur of the moment simply for the purpose of finding fault? If these objections have weight with your own party, if these objections have not behind them a majority of your membership, or if they were worthy of consideration, why were not they incorporated in the substitute which is offered to the rules of the House? I know of nothing which more commends the Democratic Party to the House than these rules as offered, unless it be the captious and almost frivolous objections made by the gentlemen upon the other side. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] concedes that in their essentials they are admirable rules. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] makes objection not to the substance, but to the form of the rules. It is a matter of comparative little importance whether the committees of this House are named by caucus and made in harmony, as far as Democrats and Republicans are concerned, or made by particular sections. The only thing which the country demanded, and the thing which these rules have provided, is the right that the House should name its committees, and the manner in which the House acted, so it acted untrammelled and intelligently, is of infinitely small importance. It is a mere matter of detail.

Every other objection that has been offered to these rules has been of a like character. The truth is that the rules as a whole stand unassailed and are unassailable. When they are reviewed it will be found that there is not a single popular demand, there is not a single rational reform demanded by the people that is not conceded by the rules. It has been suggested, sir, that committees of this House were formerly created, some for the purpose of reporting legislation that was acceptable to a coterie, some for the purpose of becoming a mausoleum of legislation that was foredoomed to eternal death. Under the rules of this House no man can hereafter name, organize, and control these committees. They provide further, even after a committee has been organized, a rational and efficient method by which committees can be discharged from further consideration of a bill if the people demand consideration of that bill. In all other details we present the rules of this House to this House, believing that they contain all the provisions, believing that they are a system by which a harmonious party can operate with facility and with efficiency in carrying out the great, the wise, and the beneficent legislation which it will soon be our pleasing duty to crystallize into the statutes of the country. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I suggest that the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] use some of his time now.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, in my legislative life I have always tried to be candid and direct. I believe in a government by the people acting through majorities. That is the way we got here as individual Representatives, and I believe that the majority in the House of Representatives, responsible only to the people of the United States, could not avoid the responsibility if they would—and I dare say they would not if they could—and must be the sole judge, with plenary power, as to what rules they will adopt and as to what legislation they will enact.

And I want to say here and now that substantially the rules proposed by this resolution are an indorsement of nearly all that is good in the rules that have evolved since the adoption of the Constitution, and, therefore, I am not going to criticize the rules where they do or where they do not sin merely because the majority of the House proposes to adopt them. Sometimes majorities and minorities tear passion to tatters and appeal—and I do not say it offensively—sometimes from the standpoint of demagoguery and claptrap to people that would not know a rule or a code of rules if they would meet in the middle of a street.

I have had a good deal to do with rules during my legislative life. I reported, as a member of the Committee on Rules in the Fifty-first Congress, what were then denounced by an almost unanimous press and by a violent minority as the "infamous Reed rules." I examined again this morning to see how that code was considered. It was thrown open to amendment, with two days' general debate, and, in addition, one day under the five-

minute rule, and with the most perfect freedom of amendment, and the previous question ordered at 5 o'clock on the third day upon the rule and all pending amendments. [Applause on the Republican side.] And at that time the Republicans had a majority of 5. You now have a majority of 63. I submit to you, as you are now flopping your wings together on that side and have complete harmony and solidarity, that perchance you might, from the standpoint of propriety, give the minority a chance to offer amendments to the rules for consideration. [Applause on the Republican side.]

But, after all, you are the best judges. You have full power. I say that you are the best judges, because you are responsible, as majorities are always responsible, and, therefore, if you are mistaken in judgment, and it leads to bad consequences, the responsibility will prove uncomfortable to you.

I say again that, substantially, I agree that this is a valuable code of rules as proposed by your resolution. I recollect very well that at the close of the Fifty-first Congress there was no leader upon the other side, there was no member of the minority, that would observe the usual courtesies and offer a resolution thanking Speaker Reed for his courtesy and fairness.

I offered the resolution, and had to move the previous question upon it, and on a roll call, without any exception, every member of the minority voted "no." It was a great revolution. And yet in the two Congresses that were presided over so ably by the late Speaker Crisp, you absolutely took all the reforms, counting a quorum, and others, and adopted them; and you propose to do it to-day. [Applause on the Republican side.] Well, for 16 years the Republican majority have lived and enacted legislation under these rules, and in that time—and I measure my words—proved by the legislation that has been written upon the statute books that it is wiser legislation, better legislation, and more far-reaching and important legislation than was ever written upon the statute books in all the history of the American Congress for over 120 years. So much for that.

But you say you have come in and that you are here. That is true. In my time of nearly 40 years of service I served in the minority 14 years. So you have come in 7 times before coming in now. I trust that your legislation will be such and that your legislative action will be such that you may not go out on account of the conditions to which the country will come under your jurisdiction and action. That remains to be seen.

Now, it is wonderful how, as the pendulum swings back and forth, men change in their opinions and in their votes. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], in my absence from the floor, I having his remarks now before me, referred evidently to the late Speaker of the House, and I just got in in time to hear the applause that followed his remarks. Gentlemen, the late Speaker of the House has no apology to offer to the majority, to the minority, to the country for the manner in which he administered that great office under the rules of the House for eight years. [Applause on the Republican side.] But the gentleman from North Carolina referred to a saying of Speaker Reed that in 15 years no Speaker had been overruled and, in his opinion, would not be. There was further great applause. But the former Speaker of this House in the last Congress, after a two days' contest, was overruled by a majority. Majorities are all powerful. For the time being they may disregard the fixed law of the land. For the time being they may run over and spit upon and trample upon the rules of the House. They have full and plenary power, including the power to remove a Speaker. I could rise in my place, Mr. Speaker, now, under the highest constitutional privilege, and move, sir, to remove you, and you would be compelled to entertain the motion, and you would be removed, provided the majority said so. [Laughter.] But, in any event, it would force consideration.

Now, one further matter. One year ago and a little over the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] arose in his place, as he stated, to a constitutionally privileged question. He had to be recognized. For what? He proposed to change the rules. It was debated. The Chair ruled that the rules could not be amended in that way and cited all the precedents that had ever been made by Speakers of all parties that had preceded him.

The gentleman from Nebraska appealed, and then there was a majority that overruled the Speaker. How? By a solid Democratic minority, plus enough voting with them on the Republican side to constitute a majority; and there was a new majority, and the Speaker's decision was overruled.

At the late session of Congress the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FULLER] arose to a question of constitutional privilege and proposed to amend the rules, offering his resolution. It was debated. The gentleman from Missouri, the present Speaker, and the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], and other

gentlemen debated the point of order, and held inside of 12 short months that that motion was not in order. And when the Chair sustained the point of order, saying that one decision made by a majority of the House would not in his opinion constitute such a precedent as to overrule all former decisions, an appeal was had, and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who arraigned the ex-Speaker to-day by inference, and the gentleman from Alabama, the leader of the majority now, but of the minority then, and the gentleman who is the present Speaker of the House, fell over themselves to sustain the Chair on precisely the same question upon which they had previously voted to overrule the Chair. [Applause on the Republican side.] I submit to the criticizing gentleman from North Carolina—no, I am told that it was the gentleman from Texas, and I will apologize to North Carolina—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. It was the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. CANNON. I did not hear him, and I have had to depend on the notes. I submit to him that the criticism that the former Speaker was overruled is fully answered by the statement that he voted along with all his party colleagues to sustain the Speaker. [Applause on the Republican side.]

And now it is said that we have a Unanimous Consent Calendar. I am glad that we have. Along with that is the saying, in the language of the distinguished gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK] and the universal representation of the uplift magazines [laughter], that it is no longer necessary to crawl upon your knees, hat in hand, to ask the Speaker for recognition for unanimous consent.

No, no. The Speaker is a Member of the House. I am a Member of the House, and I never felt less like dying than I do now. [Laughter and applause.] When the Unanimous Consent Calendar is called, if my judgment prompts me to object to the consideration of a bill, no doubt the man in charge of that bill will, figuratively, come on his hands and knees, with hat in hand, even the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MURDOCK], trying to convince his co-Member on the floor that the consideration of the bill ought not to be objected to.

I said I was glad there was a Unanimous Consent Calendar. You will not pass so many bills by unanimous consent; but I congratulate you, Mr. Speaker, as I congratulated myself upon the creation of the Unanimous Consent Calendar. Before that time I made it an absolute rule, as one Member of the House, not to submit any bill under a request for unanimous consent that I would have objected to from the floor; because the Speaker is a Member of the House, and when he refuses to submit a matter for unanimous consent he does not refuse as Speaker, but as a Member, for the Speaker always can object as a Member.

The old practice entailed upon the Speaker the absolute duty to examine every bill submitted for unanimous consent, and he did not submit a bill unless, in his judgment, it had that merit and that want of importance, if you choose, that entitled it to be considered with safety in the way in which we consider unanimous-consent bills.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. How much more time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. CANNON. Very brief time.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes more to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I think I can finish in that time. I say you will not pass so many unanimous-consent bills as you did under the old practice, but I shall vote against any amendment, now or in the future, to dispense with that calendar, because I know how it relieves the Speaker to have it.

Ah, but, Mr. Speaker, you are not a member of the Committee on Rules, and that is a great thing that has been established, because otherwise you would have been a czar. [Laughter on the Republican side.] Let me tell you about the rules. Under the uniform practice, up to the last session of Congress, the Speaker was a member of a committee of five, of which he was chairman. Proposed amendments to the rules and proposed special orders were sent to that committee. No report was ever made from any Committee on Rules until there had been a thorough canvass of the majority side of the House, and it was practically certain that it was the will of the majority that the temporary rule or special order should be made, because the business could not be properly done under the ordinary rules of the House in the presence of 30,000 other bills, and that the proposed special order would secure a majority vote. So, how the czar fades out!

To the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] I have this to say: I am neither a prophet nor the son of a prophet. The gentleman is chairman of the Committee on Rules, or

will be chairman of that committee, consisting of 11 men. I venture the prophecy here that no report will come from that committee until a caucus of the other side of the House have instructed the gentleman to make it, or there has been the equivalent of a caucus by canvassing his side of the House to assure him that he has a majority. Czar HENRY, are you any more or less a czar than was the Speaker?

Mr. ELLERBE. Hurrah for HENRY! [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Yes; hurrah for HENRY! He has done pretty good work on these rules [applause on the Democratic side] with the exception of two things. There is the want of one amendment and the presence of another that are subjects of legitimate criticism. If you will read the amendments touching the discharge of committees, you will find that there is no provision that enables the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BERGER] constituting one party and the only member of it, or any other gentleman who has perchance a wild-eyed or sensible proposition, to obtain a discharge of the Committee on Rules. The gentleman drops a resolution into the box to go to the Committee on Rules providing that they shall report a rule for the consideration of his bill. Every other committee in the House may be discharged, but under this resolution to discharge the Committee on Rules from consideration of a bill and bring it before the House a motion will not be in order, and no amendment can be offered here to amend this resolution. Why did you do it? My dear friend and colleague, the honorable gentleman from Texas, why, oh, why did you do it?

Was there any danger of interfering with your czar-like power if you were subject to the same rule that the Ways and Means Committee and the Appropriations Committee and every other committee is subjected? Nay, nay.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes more to the gentleman. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Now there is one vicious amendment to these proposed rules and that is known as the Holman amendment. It proposes to make in order legislation upon an appropriation bill provided it decreases the appropriation—by way of a salary to officers and various other provisions.

I undertake to say as practiced by the House heretofore that a man might move to amend an appropriation for a million of dollars by striking off one dollar and then loading on enough iniquitous legislation to be dragged through on an appropriation bill to wreck a party. You tried it, and after you tried it your own people amended it, and now you bring it back with a flapping of wings and a crowing, and say that you are going to work out great economies. Gentlemen, I should be apprehensive of your power had I not in my lifetime in Congress and out of Congress heard people thunder in the index. We will wait and see, and if, perchance you should be clothed with power again in 1912 [applause on the Democratic side] I said "if perchance" [laughter and applause on the Republican side], you will modify or repeal that provision.

Now, I think that is about all I care to say. I thank you for allowing me to consume more time than perhaps I ought to have taken. I yield back to the gentleman from Illinois the remainder of my time. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, we have listened with interest and with profit to the very entertaining and illuminating discussion, both of political conditions and of the rules to which we have just been treated by the distinguished gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. Whatever may be the state of our feelings politically toward that gentleman, most of the Members on this side entertain for him the kindest personal feelings, and however much we rejoice and the country rejoices at the downfall of the political system of which he so long stood out as the most conspicuous example, yet we not only entertain toward the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] the kindly personal feelings already alluded to, but also have for him that respect we feel for the warrior who can endure defeat but rebels at surrender; and when we meet him in joint discussion we feel for him that "stern joy that warriors feel for foemen worthy of their steel." The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL], and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] have undertaken to complain bitterly of this side of the House, because they say that the majority has gagged the minority. While I am not an old man either in years or point of service on this floor, yet I must say that I have had enough experience here to be utterly astonished that these gentlemen should advance such a contention. For four successive Congresses I have seen the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] rise in his place on the majority side and move that the rules of the last House be adopted and

upon that motion demand the previous question, after allowing 20 minutes' debate to each side, and without offering the slightest opportunity for amendment. And yet to-day, because the Democratic Party, in power in this House for the first time in 16 years, insists that after a general discussion of 4 hours and after the minority has been afforded an ample opportunity to offer a complete substitute for each and every rule of the code of rules we offer, these gentlemen, with amazing inconsistency, in view of their past performances, cry out to the country against the "gag" that the Democratic Party has applied to them and to the minority.

When the gentlemen have fully collaborated with each other and have completed their new treatise on "gagging," it will be a most interesting as well as amusing production.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] asserts that the code of rules we present to-day is "substantially, in all respects, a revision of the House rules." Against this statement of his we shall put the contention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON], who asserts that "substantially the rules proposed by this resolution are an indorsement of nearly all that is good in the rules that we have evolved since the adoption of the Constitution." The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] criticizes the majority for not throwing open the rules to individual amendment, because, as he contends, they are substantially different from the rules of the last Congress, and yet the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] asserts that the new rules are practically the same as those of the last House, and has congratulated the majority upon them. The truth is, in my judgment, neither gentleman is right. The rules we propose are in many respects identical with the similar rules of the last Congress and of many preceding Congresses, and yet in some respects they are vitally and fundamentally different from those of any previous Congress. The complaint of the American people against the last and the three immediately preceding Congresses was that under the rules and under the practice the power of the Speaker had been built up until he had become a literal boss, able to control legislation in the House, to stifle it when it suited his purpose, and to pass it when he favored it. This was accomplished, or was at least capable of accomplishment, by the two powers that rested in the Speaker: First, the power to appoint all committees, and, second, the power of recognition.

The American people do not believe in bosses, either in city, in State, or in Nation. Least of all will they tolerate a system of bossism in the House of Representatives. They have determined that no such system shall be possible here in this House, composed of their direct and chosen Representatives, and when the Republican Party turned a deaf ear to their demand that the system which had fastened its iron grip upon the House be destroyed, they commissioned the Democratic Party to work their will. In the last Congress enough Republican Representatives joined the solid Democratic minority to work a great reform by providing that the Committee on Rules should not be appointed by the Speaker and that the Speaker should not be a member thereof. They did not go far enough, in that they failed to also provide that the House itself, instead of the Speaker, select all of the great committees to consider and report proposed legislation. To-day we execute the will of the American people and bow to their mandate when we provide that the House itself shall elect every standing committee. This change in itself is fundamental, sweeping, and far-reaching. If no other change than this was made, the fight for popular rights in this House would not have been made in vain, and the Democratic Party would have fulfilled its pledges and served the people well.

So far as the power of recognition is concerned we frankly concede that the Speaker's right of selection among several Members who seek recognition at the same time on questions of equal privilege can not and ought not to be impaired. This power is discretionary and must, in the very nature of things, be lodged somewhere. Where, then, except in the duly chosen Speaker? So far as the Speaker's power of recognition for legislative purposes, strictly speaking, is concerned, we have very much curtailed it and rendered the individual membership of this House freer and more independent. We think we have very much improved both the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, calendar Wednesday, and the Calendar of Motions to Discharge the Committees. We believe that under the practical operation of the rules that we propose the individual Member will have a larger opportunity if he is only diligent and active. When it is asserted that some of these last-named reforms came during the Sixty-first Congress, we reply that such of them as did come were literally forced down the throats of an unwilling and protesting majority by the solid Democratic

vote aided by a few independent Republicans. To-day the Democratic Party preserves these reforms, has improved them, and hopes to still further improve them in the future.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes, sir.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. I quite agree with the gentleman on the proposition that the rule as to discharging committees is improved. Does not the gentleman think that rule ought to be further amended, so that there will be a way left in the rules themselves for their own amendment? In other words, so that a resolution introduced for the purpose of amending a rule and being referred to the Committee on Rules, if not acted upon by that committee, might be gotten before the House?

Mr. HARDWICK. I will answer the gentleman with perfect candor on that proposition. In theory he may be right; but the Rules Committee is the one important political committee in this House controlling general procedure in the transaction of its business, and we do not think the Rules Committee should be discharged by any procedure until the majority can fully consider it and fully manifest its will. Until this happens, it should not be done.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. Is it not true that under the rules as now proposed there is no way left for amending a rule unless the Committee on Rules shall see fit to recommend it?

Mr. HARDWICK. Yes; there is no way to get consideration of such a proposition.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. There is no way to get consideration of it.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will also say to the gentleman that the objection he makes could also be applied to all propositions on the Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. Then, if you put a bill on its appropriate calendar, you would not get immediate consideration for it.

Mr. MARTIN of South Dakota. That is true; but you will get it on the way.

Mr. HARDWICK. I will tell the gentleman again candidly that we do not think that the political party in power should make the concession he suggests.

The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] and several of his associates on that side of the Chamber who sympathized with him in his fight in the last House on this rules question complained that we did not allow each and every Member of the minority full opportunity of amending each and every rule we present.

In reply, we say that we realize that this Government of ours is practically operated and conducted through the agency of political parties, and we submit that on so important a question as the adoption of rules for the transaction of public business and for the execution of the will of the people the party in power must adopt such rules as it thinks best suited to meet the responsibility resting upon it and to enable it to execute the popular will. Of course if it should adopt rules that are unfair to the minority, unjust and oppressive to the people, and subversive of their rights, then the party in power must pay the penalty for such exercise of its power, as the Republican Party did in the last election; but the Democratic Party in this House, conscious of its responsibility and anxious to meet it, presents to the House and to the country, as a result of party action, a code of rules upon which it is willing to stand, as fair and just to the minority and to the country, and thinks it has the perfect right to require of its great political opponent in this body that it shall present its proposition on this great subject as a matter of party policy, if at all. If we are able to agree on this side of the Chamber unanimously and harmoniously on our proposition about this much-vexed and much-discussed question of rules, and it shall develop that the minority is unable to present any definite proposition in lieu of what we offer to the House and to the country, or any policy on this question on which they can agree upon among themselves, then we say it but serves to emphasize and drive home the fact that the Democratic Party is united and harmonious, able to transact the public business, and able to meet its responsibilities, while the Republican Party on this floor is divided and discordant, unable to agree on anything, even when in a minority. [Loud applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, just one more word in reference to the criticism made by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON]. The gentleman objects to the provision of the rules reenacting what is known as the Holman amendment, which provides in effect that a provision of or an amendment to an appropriation bill shall not be subject to the point of order that it changes existing law, provided the amendment retrenches expenditure. I am

not surprised that the gentlemen on the other side object to any rule that renders it impossible to reduce expenditure. Their present performances are quite consistent with their past record. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] particularly objects to this Holman provision, because he says that it confers on the House the power to legislate in connection with general appropriation bills.

The reason that he gives for objecting is one of the strongest reasons I have for supporting this great change in the rules, which, in my opinion, will do so much to enhance both the dignity and importance of this body.

It is my deliberate judgment that when the House surrendered some years ago the right to legislate on appropriation bills it immeasurably lowered both its dignity in the eyes of the public and its power as a legislative factor. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Certainly I shall favor, and I think I voice the sentiment on this side when I say we shall favor, the employment of all reasonable and proper means to increase the dignity and importance of this House; that comes direct every two years from the American people and is responsive to the popular will. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The rules we have presented to-day are, of course, not perfect; the work of man never is. We do not believe, however, that the minority can offer as a substitute any definite proposition that is better; nor do we think that the trifling and unimportant changes that have been suggested during the progress of this discussion are of enough value to justify the House in halting now at the adoption of the resolution of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY]. We believe we have met the popular demand upon us and have executed the popular will in the preparation and presentation of this code of rules, and we have endeavored to make our general rules as fair and just as possible, and we do not think that special rules should be forced out of the Committee on Rules except in response to the definite will and declared policy of the party in power. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I trust the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] will use some of his time now.

Mr. MANN. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED]. [Applause.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, under the special rule just adopted under the previous question, without any opportunity for debate, the time allowed is of course too short to discuss this proposed body of rules, but of what use is discussion when we are not permitted to amend them? Under that special rule thus arbitrarily and unfairly adopted we are not permitted even to offer amendments. I deem it worth while, however, to call the attention of the House and of the country to one or two points. There never was before submitted to this House, from the foundation of the Government to the present moment, any considerable revision of the rules which had not first been considered by a committee of the House and then submitted with a printed report of that committee—and usually, also, with a minority report—setting forth in each instance the old rule, the alleged mischief, and the proposed remedy.

Here we have thrust upon us, without any such report or explanation and without even any opportunity to read them, a body of rules which most of us have been permitted to see for the first time this morning, and which we must, under the special rule, take up at once for passage. We are graciously permitted two hours for discussion, not time enough even to read these rules, and then we must vote for or against them as a whole, being denied the privilege of offering a single amendment. Is this "the free and untrammelled expression of the representatives of the people" which the country has been taught to believe the Democrats would permit when they got control of this House? I call attention to the proposed Rule XXI. It is our rule plus what is styled the Holman amendment. Away back in the early days there obtained in this body the practice of "log rolling" and passing all kinds of legislation by riders upon appropriation bills. It was found to be absolutely destructive of good order, good government, and economy, and it was abolished. The rule finally adopted, in force in the last Congress and many previous Congresses, made it out of order for the committee to report or for anybody to suggest as an amendment any provision changing existing law or providing for an appropriation without previous authority of law.

That rule, which has saved the Government so many millions of dollars, was contained in Rule XXI of the Rules of the Sixty-first Congress in this language:

2. No appropriation shall be reported in any general appropriation bill, or be in order as an amendment thereto, for any expenditure not previously authorized by law, unless in continuation of appropriations for such public works and objects as are already in progress. Nor shall any provision in any such bill or amendment thereto changing existing law be in order.

That was the result of the wisdom and experience of both parties for more than a century. Our Democratic friends now propose to readopt that language, with the following addition:

Except such as being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill: *Provided*, That it shall be in order further to amend such bill upon the report of the committee or any joint commission authorized by law or the House Members of any such commission having jurisdiction of the subject matter of such amendment, which amendment being germane to the subject matter of the bill shall retrench expenditures.

That addition, known as the Holman amendment, has been tried heretofore and found to work so badly that it was eliminated and rejected in a Democratic House presided over by Speaker Carlisle. Now you propose to reenact it.

It has been found to be absolutely essential to good and economical government that appropriation bills shall be stripped of all provisions except appropriations, and that the Appropriations Committee shall be stripped of all power except the power to report appropriations. This amendment to the rules will place that committee in charge of pretty near all the legislation of this House. It will enable appropriations to be made without previous authority of law for their expenditure, and it will permit existing law to be changed upon appropriation bills.

It is urged that appropriation bills will be subject only to such amendments as are germane. Well, in these great appropriation bills, containing, some of them, a hundred different subjects, almost anything is germane that anybody may choose to offer. That is to say, an amendment upon almost any subject may be so skillfully drawn as to be germane to a general appropriation bill.

Let me give you a few illustrations of the operation of this Holman amendment when it was heretofore in force.

Speaker Kerr, of Indiana, a Democratic Speaker, presiding over a Democratic House, ruled that a proposition to transfer the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Department of the Interior to the War Department was germane to the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation bill.

Mr. William L. Wilson, that distinguished Democrat from West Virginia, presiding as Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, ruled that a proposition to transfer the Pension Office from the Interior Department to the War Department was germane to a general appropriation bill.

On another occasion—and I wish particularly to call attention to this—when in the Post Office appropriation bill an item was reached appropriating \$9,500,000 for the transportation of the mails, an amendment was offered reducing it to \$9,400,000, but adding "of which sum \$150,000 may be used by the Postmaster General to maintain and secure from railroads necessary and special facilities for the postal service." Here is an illustration of economy which may be expected under the operation of this Holman amendment. There was upon the face of the amendment a reduction of \$10,000 in the amount of the appropriation. Speaker Carlisle ruled that the amendment was germane and was in order, although there was no previous authority for the expenditure of the \$150,000. Under that amendment, adopted by a Democratic Congress, under the operation of the Holman rule, there was fastened upon this Government a system of mail subsidies to certain railroads which we did not get rid of for nearly thirty years, and under the operation of it two or three railroad companies drew out of the Federal Treasury nearly five millions of dollars, not one cent of which they ever could have secured except for the operation of the so-called Holman amendment, and for not one cent of which did the Government or the people ever derive the slightest benefit.

The authority of law for the railroad mail subsidy having thus been secured, appropriations for subsequent years could be made without any reduction in the total appropriation. The amount of the mail subsidy was simply added to what would otherwise have been the total of the general appropriation, and the Government was out of pocket just that much money. This Holman rule can be made to operate in that way in a thousand different directions when it has been adopted as one of the rules of the present House. That is the way it will work, and yet it has been heralded to the four corners of the country as a great instrumentality in bringing about the economies which our Democratic brethren say they are about to enforce.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have heard a great deal about the dismissal of certain employees whose salaries aggregate about \$182,000. Their places, we are told, are to be left vacant. No resolution or bill has been offered abolishing those places. They are still authorized by law, but the Republicans who held them have been or will be promptly dismissed. The offices,

however, remain, and it is a safe prediction that in less than 90 days from this date every one of them will be filled by a lusty Democratic political worker. So much for the insincerity of that pretended economy.

This Holman rule, skillfully worked, can be made to cover almost any kind of extravagance and permit appropriations for a thousand objects for which there is now no authority of law and which could not now be made without the previous enactment of a separate measure authorizing such expenditure. Its operation will not be in the interest of economy at all. Any amendment reducing an appropriation is now and always has been in order without any Holman rule. The object of it is to accomplish some other purpose upon an appropriation bill. It is the height of insincerity to hold out to the public that its adoption is in the interest of economy. Adopt it, and after less than one year of its operation the people of this country may well exclaim, "Oh, economy, what wrongs have been done in thy name." [Applause on the Republican side.]

The object and the effect of this Holman rule will be to lessen the importance of the other committees and vastly enlarge the importance of the Appropriations Committee by putting all kinds of general legislation within its authority. "Upon the report of the committee" any germane amendment is to be in order. What committee? Why, the Appropriations Committee. It may report as an amendment a matter that might properly come from the Judiciary Committee, or the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee, or any other of the great committees, and yet it will be in order upon a general appropriation bill. The Appropriations Committee appropriates nearly a billion of dollars every year. This power of appropriation gives it a wonderful command in the House. Add to that the power of general legislation, and instead of bowing to the Speaker for favors everybody will have to bow to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations. With the power to give or withhold appropriations used as a big stick Members may be clubbed into the support of any matter of general legislation which that committee may choose to report.

In the last House, the Republicans being in control, the Speaker appointed 11 Republicans upon that committee. In this Congress, the Democrats being in control, propose to take 14 places on that committee.

Upon the whole, so far as I have had time to read this set of rules which is to be forced upon us without the power of even offering an amendment, I wish to be perfectly frank and candid and say that, with the exception of this Holman amendment and one or two other changes, it is not a bad set of rules. It is practically a reenactment of the same rules which we adopted in the recent Republican House. Such changes as have been made in this set of Democratic rules have been either unnecessary or unwise. As a sample of the unnecessary I point to Rule X. In its new form it reads there, "shall be elected by the House" the standing committees. The old rule provided that they were to be appointed by the Speaker "unless otherwise authorized by the House." It was not necessary to change that rule. It has always been permissible under Republican rules for the House to make the committee assignments if a majority so desired. All you had to do was to adopt a motion to that effect. Many years ago, when committee places were assigned otherwise than by the Speaker, the result was unsatisfactory. Whether it will work better now remains to be seen. Whether a better adjustment of committee assignments can be made by a Democratic caucus than by yourself, Mr. Speaker CLARK, with your long service, your familiarity with the work required of the respective committees, and of the qualifications of Members for such work, may well be doubted. Personally, I should be more than willing to leave the selection in your hands.

One of the first results of the new plan appears to be that in order to effect a sort of compromise and satisfy the Democratic aspirants it has been found necessary to make 35 new committee places; and it has been found necessary to so far depart from the "square-deal" principle that you allow only one of those 35 places to be filled by a Republican. I am not unwilling that you shall try the experiment of having the committees appointed otherwise than by the Speaker, although I believe that the making of the appointments by him would tend to wiser selection and better results in legislation. There are, however, a good many gentlemen upon this floor who not only believe that the Speaker ought not to have the power of appointment, but they also believe that these appointments ought not to be determined in a party caucus. They think that there ought to be appointed or elected by the House a committee on committees, to consist of Members of both parties, the majority party, of course, having a majority of the committee. Such a

committee, after meeting in conference, these gentlemen think, would bring about the most satisfactory results of all. But you do not give them a chance to offer such an amendment and have it voted upon.

I heard a Democratic Member of this House, when discussing the Republican rules, say:

Give these Representatives their rights upon this floor. Let every man have the privilege to rise in his place to present what he chooses for the consideration of this House, and then let that matter be disposed of by a free and untrammelled expression of the representatives of the people.

That same honorable gentleman is one of the men assigned for duty on the Ways and Means Committee, delegated to prepare and submit to the Democratic caucus the assignments to places on all the other committees. That same gentleman has just voted for the previous question, which deprived us of an opportunity for "a free and untrammelled expression" or any expression at all upon the adoption of the special rule under which we are now proceeding, which rule requires us to vote for or against the adoption of this body of 43 rules without the poor privilege of any Member to rise in his place and present even the smallest amendment, or any amendment whatever, "to be disposed of by a free and untrammelled expression of the representatives of the people."

The platform adopted by the Democratic national convention at Denver demanded a change in the rules and regulations of this House. Through the press, by means of campaign literature, and upon the stump, the people were led to believe that there was something terribly wrong about the rules of this House, which made it impossible for every Member to get every bill passed that he or his people wanted. They were led to believe that if your party got in power you would bring about some great reforms. Now, what do you propose to do? Why, simply to reenact the Republican rules, with a few unwise changes, the worst of which is the readoption of the Holman amendment. Indeed, if that were omitted, and you had allowed opportunity for discussion and amendment, I should not be complaining. I do not now so much complain of what you propose to do as of the manner in which you are doing it. You have held out to the people through all these years that Republican rules and Republican majorities were arbitrary and despotic, that free debate was not allowed, and that Members were given no freedom of action. Now let us make a little comparison. The so-called Reed rules wrought only about four important changes in the rules as they had previously existed.

The revision made at that time was first considered by the Committee on Rules. It was then submitted to the House with two reports from that committee, a majority report and a minority report, each of which discussed minutely each proposed change, and the two reports together gave every argument that could possibly be made either for or against the changes. Then the proposed new rules were read in the House and were debated for three days. They were then read again, paragraph by paragraph, under the five-minute rule, and any Member on either side of the House who desired to offer an amendment had an opportunity to do so. It was only at the end of the third day that the final vote was taken. What have you done? You have brought in a set of 43 rules. They have not even been read from the Clerk's desk. This side is allowed two hours to discuss them. No one on either side is permitted to offer or will have an opportunity to vote upon any amendment. It is no answer to say that in other cases in matters of legislation Republican majorities may have been arbitrary and drastic. You have condemned those things. You have preached to the people about them. You have told what you would do when you got in power. I wish merely to expose the insincerity of your promises and to contrast them with this present performance. I wish merely to call the attention of the country to the fact that in the matter of stifling debate, in the matter of depriving the people's representatives of an opportunity to present by way of amendment matters in which they or their constituents may be interested, in short, in all those things of which you have heretofore so loudly complained you have within the first 24 hours after your accession to power made the Democratic little finger thicker than the Republican thigh ever was. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Would the gentleman from Illinois prefer to go on with another speech on his side now?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman knows that we have occupied nearly twice as much time as the gentleman has.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have never agreed to the political heresy of the poet that—

For forms of government let fools contest;
That which is best administered is best.

but I have been impressed with the fact that it contains something of truth by the criticisms offered here to-day to the rules proposed by the majority.

The American people are a practical people, and as a practical people they will judge this side of the House as they have judged that side of the House—not by the intricacies of parliamentary law, but by the results that follow from the administration of the power given to us as a party.

This is still a country that is governed by and through parties. The day may come when the speech of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] may be logical and proper, but that day has not yet come.

Having then party government, it is to my mind entirely logical and proper that the party here charged with responsibility should present as a party the rules that it considers necessary to enable it to properly discharge that responsibility. And equally should the minority party present its proposition touching procedure. In presenting its rules, the majority must pay proper heed to the rights of the minority and to the rights of the individual Member, and if it fails to do so, to that extent it abuses its power and is censurable. It is the province of the minority to make clear such abuse by criticism and to prevent it, if possible, by offering a substitute proposition remedying such evils. But that the majority in assuming control is properly subject to criticism in not affording each Member of the House opportunity to express his individual views and to offer individual amendments embodying them I do not admit.

I have never stood in this House as the advocate of extreme rule on the part of the majority. I believe civilization is measured by the rights that are secured to a minority, no matter how small. But I believe that in a legislative body like this, when we of the majority present to you of the minority the opportunity to present a code of rules that you consider should be adopted as against ours, we have done all that can be asked of us in fairness.

Much is said about this being the adoption of a new code of rules, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] undertakes to draw a fanciful distinction, so far as the rights of the minority are concerned, between Congresses that represent a change of party control from the prior Congress and those that do not—a distinction that I am quite sure exists only in the gentleman's mind. We present here not an entirely new set of rules, but we present a set of rules that undertakes in two major particulars to change the rules that have been known as Republican rules, and which until recently have controlled the House. One change has been in taking away from the Speaker the power of appointing committees. Another rule, and to my mind a very much more far-reaching rule, is that which takes away from committees the power to stifle legislation. The complaints that we have had, as I have pointed out heretofore, have not been so much as to the personnel of committees as they have been to the power of committees, and you do not change personnel necessarily, though you do sometimes, by changing method of selection, but you do afford a great relief by changing the power of committees. We have provided here a rule whereby a committee may be discharged from the consideration of legislation when, in the opinion of the House, it is not considering that legislation in good faith or desirous of reporting it.

Personally, I should have liked a rule not only discharging committees but one enabling the majority using it to make preferential the bill taken from the committee. I embodied my view in the proposed rule introduced by me in the last Congress and which served as a basis for the rule now offered. It is believed by many that this rule is all that is necessary, and until experience shall prove to the contrary, I am willing to abide by it. If this rule works as it is intended, we will have given real liberty to the House. If it does not work as intended, I for one shall favor an enlargement of it so that it will work that way.

Much criticism has been made of the Holman amendment because it gives to the House the power to legislate on appropriation bills. I agree with the statement of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] that when the House surrendered its power, under proper circumstances, to put legislation upon appropriation bills, it surrendered what has been the greatest instrument in favor of the liberties of the English-speaking people since the time that parliamentary government was established. It was in England that the House of Commons, by putting conditions upon the supply bills of the King, gained for

the people their greatest liberties and rights; and a Democratic Congress, confronted with a Republican President, confronted with the other branch of the National Legislature in control of the opposite party, can well afford to give to itself such power as will enable it to enforce those demands which it believes to be in the interest of the people, whose mandate it so recently bears. [Applause.] It may be that a party having control of every branch of the Government need not have this rule; but speaking for myself, I am glad that the majority of this House will be in a position to make its voice actually felt by those other branches whose cooperation is essential to legislation in this Government.

Mr. CULLOP. Will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. CULLOP. I desire to ask the gentleman from Kentucky if the criticism made on the adoption of these rules by the opposite side of the House is not all remedied in the opportunity they have under the rule to offer a substitute to liberalize or amend the rules as they may desire?

Mr. SHERLEY. As I have said, in my judgment ample right is given to the minority in that particular.

Mr. OLMSTED. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. OLMSTED. I desire to ask whether I correctly infer from what the gentleman said that if his party had control of all branches of the Government, he would not be in favor of the so-called Holman amendment?

Mr. SHERLEY. The gentleman is drawing an inference of his own; but this I do say to him, that the fact that we have not such control is one of the warrants for the rule. If that be treason, the gentleman is welcome to make the most of it. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. OLMSTED. It is the same thing that I inferred.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now, we have had some suggestions made here as to amendments, though none of the seriously proposed amendments are embodied in the substitute offered by the minority leader, Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS] complains bitterly of the condition in which he finds himself, and he suggests various rules that he thinks would improve the present proposed rules. He suggests that instead of the one master we were supposed to have when the Speaker appointed the committees we should have 15 masters, arranged by geography. If I am to have a master at all, I would rather have 1 than 15, because I could at least place responsibility. The Democrats, in arranging that the committees should not be appointed by the Speaker, did not give into the hands of 15 men the power to name those committees. They have used a committee in the preliminary arrangement of proposed committee membership in this House, but these rules provide that actual membership on committees shall be determined by the House itself. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I was surprised that the gentleman from Nebraska, who would have us view him as the embodiment of all progress and reform, is so willing to create 15 masters from whose decision there would be no appeal. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He also criticized the rules of the House because we did not provide for open meetings of all committees. In my judgment no man who has ever served upon any great committee of this House but knows that the enforcement of such a rule would benefit no one, but would result in great delay and great hindrance of the public business. Such a rule is predicated on the idea that Members of Congress are not honest men, and that unless the flood light of publicity is always turned upon every movement of theirs they will be guilty of wrongdoing.

I am not willing to admit such a contention as to myself, and I am not willing to believe it of my colleagues. I do not believe that the membership of this House is composed of cowards, and I do not believe that the people's cause has suffered because of holding our committee meetings as we have held them.

The trouble has been not in the discussion of committee members among themselves, but it has been the fact that heretofore there has been no way for the majority of the House to compel a committee to report. Such a method was imperative for the liberty of this House, and I believe we have provided for it; and having provided for it, we have answered all the just criticisms that could be brought against the rules.

In the past eight years I have not indulged in undue criticism; I have not undertaken to criticize the majority simply because they were the majority. I have always put to the test every rule—was it fair to the minority and to the majority?—without reference to which side I happened to be on. I believe that that is the only test, and I am willing here in my place

to-day to say that the proposed rules of the House give at present ample liberty to the Members, and I believe that it depends largely upon the membership as to how far they will have freedom. Many restrictions have been placed upon membership here because men have not been willing to restrain themselves. If every Member will undertake to enforce these rules in the true spirit of their enactment, we will not have any just cause, in my judgment, to complain.

Now, something has been said about the failure to provide a way to discharge the Committee on Rules. There is some force in the criticism, but bear in mind that the Committee on Rules does not have referred to it propositions of legislation. They only have referred to it questions relating to procedure. Now, if you have actually and effectively provided a method whereby legislation can be brought forward before the House, any further question of procedure becomes of very much less importance. It is not near so important that the Committee on Rules should be subject to a motion to discharge as it is that the various legislative committees should be so subject.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Kentucky yield to the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SHERLEY. For a question.

Mr. MILLER. Can the gentleman state how many resolutions were referred to the Rules Committee at the last Congress?

Mr. SHERLEY. I can not.

Mr. MILLER. Was there not over a thousand?

Mr. SHERLEY. I do not know and I do not think it is material. I will tell the gentleman why I do not think it is material. I do not suppose there were anything like a thousand; but if there were a thousand it was because it was only through the agency of the Committee on Rules that you could legislate at times. But if we have remedied the major complaint we do not need to be bothered by a secondary remedy. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We can go directly to the matter.

Mr. MILLER. Will the gentleman yield for a second question?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes.

Mr. MILLER. Irrespective of the number of resolutions referred to that committee in the last Congress, is it not true that at least nine-tenths of the resolutions referred to that committee related to investigations and were entirely distinct from matters of procedure?

Mr. SHERLEY. I should say not; but under the rules of the House there were many resolutions relating to departments, most of them resolutions of inquiry, privileged under the rules.

Mr. Speaker, it has been impossible in the time that was at my disposal to deal exhaustively with a subject as comprehensive and intricate as that of the rules, but I have endeavored in candor and fairness to present the major propositions here involved. Speaking for myself, and, as I believe, voicing the opinion of my party colleagues, I say that we have in good faith presented a code of rules that has proper regard for the rights of the two major parties and of the individual Members, and if defects in these rules become apparent in the actual test of experience under them, the majority will gladly and sincerely provide the changes necessary to accomplish this end. [Applause.]

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that there is much that I can add to what has already been said about these rules. In my judgment some very valuable additions have been made to the rules that have been adopted by former Congresses. Especially this is so, I think, with reference to the rule which we have changed regarding the discharge of committees. Under that rule, if it works out the way we believe it will, there will be an opportunity for Members to get bills on the calendar which the country demands, and when those bills are put upon the calendars it then will be an easy matter, if the bill be demanded by the country, to have it taken up for consideration. Many rules which Members sometimes use or might use for the purpose of stifling legislation ought not to be used when the people demand certain legislation against which those rules might apply. I believe that with the adoption of these rules, and as one member of the Committee on Rules I desire to say—

Mr. MANN. There is no Committee on Rules.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Well, there will be; and when that committee is appointed, if I am a member, I desire to say that I believe a majority of the members of that committee will be willing at all times to consider any resolution that is for the good government of this House. I will say this, that the people have spoken, and they have demanded that certain legislation shall be put in effect by this Congress, and I believe that these rules which you are asked to adopt will be such as will

enable this side of the House to put into operation the laws that the people have demanded for their relief.

I think the rule, which was an old rule of the Fifty-third Congress, that will enable an amendment to be placed upon an appropriation bill when it retrenches expenditures, if the amendment be germane to the subject, making that amendment in order, is a very important rule to the House of Representatives, as it will enable the Members whenever it is necessary to cut down expenses. We have seen the time in the last Congress when a recommendation had been made to do away with a certain item in a bill, and because that item was authorized by law, although it was a ruthless expense on the Government, it was impossible to get the item out of the appropriation bill, because it sometimes affected the districts of the individual Members and was perhaps demanded by some particular part of the country. Under this rule no man can make a point of order upon that sort of an amendment to an appropriation bill.

It has also been provided by these rules that any Member who has a bill upon the Calendar for Unanimous Consent, if it is once objected to, may have an opportunity to again place that bill upon the calendar and at some future time to ask its consideration. It occurs to me that this is but fair and right to Members who desire to pass bills by unanimous consent.

The rule providing the way bills affecting the revenue shall be considered in this House is also an important one. It seems to be the settled policy of the majority party of this House to revise the tariff by amending one schedule at a time. This way of revising the tariff was advocated a good many years ago by a Representative from the State of Illinois, Hon. William M. Springer.

President Taft became a convert to this Democratic form of revision after the passage of the Payne-Aldrich bill, and there was published in the Republican campaign textbook of 1910 a letter written by the President to Hon. Duncan E. McKinlay, of California, in which he uses the following language in reference to the passage of bills through Congress revising the tariff by schedule and the kind of rule that should be adopted. He says:

Of course, this will be impracticable unless Congress itself shall adopt the parliamentary rule, as I hope it will, that a bill to amend one schedule of the tariff may not be subject to a motion to amend by adding changes in other schedules.

It occurs to me that the Members on the other side of this House have little cause of complaint of such a rule being passed at this time. One of the greatest reforms of the rules of the Sixty-first Congress was made when the Democrats combined with a minority of the Republicans and elected a Committee on Rules and provided that the Speaker should not be a member of that committee.

These rules which are now before the House for action go further, and provide that all standing committees of the House, together with the chairman, shall be elected by the Members of the House, thus taking away from the Speaker the power to form these committees with any reference to control legislation, and putting in the hands of the membership of this House the control of its committees and say what Members shall constitute those committees. The country has demanded that these reforms should be made in the rules, and the Democratic Party, in keeping faith with the people, have endeavored to carry out their will. These rules I have no doubt will permit the will of the people to be carried out if it is so desired by the membership of this House. It should be the object of a legislative body as constituted by representatives of the people to endeavor to enact such legislation as is demanded by a majority as near as possible. Relief from excessive taxation and an economical administration of the affairs of this Government have been demanded, and it is the duty of this House to carry out this mandate. As Representatives we would be recreant to our duty if we failed to do these things. The Democratic Party of this House proposes to give fair discussion to all matters proposed, but they do not intend that filibustering for the purpose of defeating legislation that a majority of the people have demanded shall be permitted. There have been other changes in these rules which, in our judgment, we believe will work well. I have every reason to believe that if any amendments are necessary for the proper regulation and to secure the orderly procedure in this House that the rules will be so amended as to carry out the wishes of a majority of the Members and of the country. It should be the duty of the Committee on Rules to give free and fair hearing to all matter proposed. The Rules Committee will not be a graveyard where propositions for the good government of the House can be laid away. This side of the House has offered to the minority an opportunity to propose a substitute for these rules and an opportunity to put

every Member on record as to his vote on these two propositions as now proposed.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I believe the proposed rules are, in the main, an improvement over the rules of the Sixty-first Congress, but they fall far short of what should be embodied in the rules governing this body. For a number of years there has been upon this side of the House a little group of Republicans called "insurgents," who have been fighting for freedom in this House—freedom of debate, freedom of amendment—and during those many contests they have had almost the unanimous support of the Democratic minority. What is the situation before us to-day? You have adopted a resolution as drastic in effect, as subversive of freedom in this House as any resolution that has ever been adopted in the House of Representatives. Were you sincere two years ago when you protested against this very kind of a proceeding? If you were, are you sincere this afternoon when you stand for the same kind of a proceeding? The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] said, in the first place, that a distinction was made with reference to this resolution because it was a party measure, and, later, he said that a distinction should be made because it was a caucus measure. All of the old Members will recall that two years ago during the special session the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] stood in this aisle beside my desk and condemned caucus rule, condemned the action of the Republican majority in preventing amendments upon the tariff bill, and do you remember how he pictured so graphically the Members going into a caucus and having their hands manacled? I would like to have the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] hold up his hands this afternoon for inspection of this House, and tell us how he likes being manacled. If we had an opportunity to offer some amendments, they would be adopted by this House, and the reason that you have denied the opportunity for amendment is that you do not dare trust your own majority to stand by these rules when improvements may be offered to them from this side.

I want to speak of one or two such amendments. You all remember during the last session of Congress calendar Wednesday was entirely done away with through a defect of the rule; that a committee secured the consideration of a bill upon calendar Wednesday and held the floor during the balance of that session until the consideration of that bill was completed.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LENROOT. I will when I finish this sentence. The gentleman from Pennsylvania secured consideration of the judicial codification bill, and every Wednesday during that session was taken up by that bill when many more important measures remained upon the calendar and failed for want of action.

Mr. SHERLEY. Now will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I will.

Mr. SHERLEY. Could not the House on calendar Wednesday have ended that by a majority vote?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired. The Chair will state that the gentleman from Illinois has 35 minutes and the gentleman from Texas 37 minutes.

Mr. MANN. I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON].

Mr. MADISON. Mr. Speaker, I rise for the purpose of replying to my friend from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY]. I want to tell him why it was impossible to pass a motion to lay aside the codification bill, or Moon bill, as it was called. It was because there were so many men here who knew that there were other bills which would come up on calendar Wednesday that would embarrass them to vote upon them, and they did not want to face those embarrassing situations.

Mr. SHERLEY. Will the gentleman permit?

Mr. MADISON. Certainly.

Mr. SHERLEY. Is not that simply another way of saying that the majority preferred the Moon bill to something else?

Mr. MADISON. No; it is not. If this rule remains as it is proposed to have it, then, as in the past, calendar Wednesday can and will be used for the purpose of blocking legislation and affording a refuge for men who do not care to face questions that ought to come up before this House for consideration. [Applause.] I deplore the fact, as one of the few men who stood here on this side during the recent Congress for the liberation of this House, that my friends on the other side, who have now come into possession of this House, and who have the opportunity to completely revise and reform its rules, have not improved their opportunity and have not risen to the high

standard that the country expected of them in the system of rules they now propose.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Will the gentleman yield for a question? The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT].

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I have been agreeably surprised by hearing so little of criticism from gentlemen on the other side of the aisle of the rules that are presented. It is exceedingly gratifying to find it so, and I am constrained to believe that it may be possible, judging from the lack of criticism which has come from that side of the aisle, that the reading of the rules as presented may have been another of those disappointments that have been so frequently coming to that side of the aisle recently growing out of the fact that the Democratic Party was showing itself able to do the business of the country. It is very gratifying, Mr. Speaker, for a different reason, and that is that there is not a suggestion in such criticisms that have been offered that there is in the code of rules proposed here a single proposition unfair to the minority, whether it be the political minority or the legislative minority of this House. I assume, therefore, that the lack of criticism in that respect must indicate that they have found in these rules nothing that is unfair to the minority as a minority. It is true there has been a suggestion on the floor that there was a certain unfairness in the enlargement of committees or rather in the manner in which that enlargement was to be made, but that criticism does not go to the rules themselves. Now, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. In the early part of the debate the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN] made an inquiry, with regard to Rule VI, page 28, as to business on the Private Calendar, and he was informed that later in the debate the matter would be discussed. I desire to call the gentleman's attention to the new rule, which seems to me to be so drafted that it would not be possible, if experience of the future shall be that of the past, to reach private legislation or legislation on the Private Calendar other than legislation coming from the Committees on Claims and War Claims, and from the Committee on Military Affairs touching the removal of charges of desertion. The gentleman is aware of the fact that the Committee on Public Lands, the Committees on Military Affairs and on Naval Affairs are committees reporting a large amount of legislation that goes on the Private Calendar. In the 14 years I have been in the House there never has been a time when that class of legislation could be reached under this rule, for there never has been a time when the private bills on the Private Calendar from these other committees have all been disposed of.

Mr. GARRETT. I think the gentleman is mistaken about the bills from the other calendars not being disposed of. The effect of this rule, I will say to the gentleman, is this: That it gives to this character of business coming from those two committees the same privilege that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has heretofore had, and with that character of privilege there will be such an expedition of that business that it will be easy to reach the claims to which the gentleman refers.

Mr. MONDELL. If my memory serves me right, and I have made some inquiries, in the last seven Congresses the legislation on the Private Calendar from these preferred committees has never all been disposed of, and therefore other legislation coming from the Public Lands Committee, from the Military and Naval Committees, could not have been reached under this form of rule.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, the difficulty has been that this business coming from these two committees has been permitted to accumulate on the calendars in such quantities that it was not possible to deal with it in the limited time allowed under the rule to these committees. There has not been a day during the entire session of Congress, at times, that these committees have had a chance, because they have not the privilege. They have the privilege now and can deal with the business. I think the gentleman will not find practical difficulty about that; but, if that should be, it is a minor detail, which can be, of course, corrected.

Mr. DALZELL. I think there is a much more serious criticism to be made than that made by the gentleman from Wyoming. Under all the rules that have existed heretofore, both Democratic and Republican, Friday has been set apart for private business. In other words, to get rid of private business you would have to have an affirmative vote of the House. Now,

in this code of rules you have omitted that rule, and you have provided, on the other hand, that private business should be entertained when you take affirmative action, when you make a motion to go into Committee of the Whole for the consideration of private business.

In other words, under the rule as it existed up to this time, Friday is the day set aside for private bills automatically, unless dispensed with. Under your rule you can not have a private-bill day unless you have affirmative action on the part of the House. Suppose the House resolves to go into Committee of the Whole on the Private Calendar and pass a number of bills, say, 10, 12, or 15, and reports to the House, and does not order the previous question, when will those bills come up again, or will they ever come up?

Mr. GARRETT. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he asks if the committee reports to the House and does not order the previous question, when would those bills come up again? Whenever the House chose to order the previous question. That is to say, when it would be in order to move the previous question.

Mr. DALZELL. They would not come up at any time devoted to other business by the rule. Under our rules now those bills would come up again on the next calendar day.

Mr. GARRETT. That does not change the rule in that respect in any way.

Mr. DALZELL. Certainly it does.

Mr. GARRETT. It does this: It places those claims in precisely the same condition that the invalid-pension claims have been placed in heretofore.

Mr. DALZELL. The gentleman misunderstands me. He is talking about another matter. I say that under the rules that existed up to this time, in both Democratic and Republican Congresses, Friday was private-bill day and you could not get rid of it except by vote of the House. Now, you have not a private-bill day.

Mr. GARRETT. Yes; we have.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. The same rule that we had before—the special order.

Mr. GARRETT. Precisely the same rule as the special order carried.

Mr. DALZELL. What rule?

Mr. GARRETT. If the gentleman will pardon me, I think I have answered him. The language in regard to invalid pensions is precisely the language of the standing order, and the language in regard to the war claims and claims is precisely the language of the standing order, except it gives them the privileged character that invalid pensions has had heretofore.

Mr. DALZELL. I would like to know where in your code of rules you establish a private-bill day.

Mr. GARRETT. In that section—

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JAMES in the chair). The time of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has expired.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I beg to congratulate the gentlemen on the opposite side of the House on the liberality of the resolution under which we are considering this code. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

To be sure, you do not throw the code open to amendment, and you do not permit it to be read, but you to provide that it shall be introduced and that it shall be voted upon. Oh, gentlemen, why do you not give an opportunity for amendment? I have not heard a single argument advanced as to why this code should not be open to amendment which would not be equally sound if it were brought forward as a reason to show that no bill of any sort should be open to amendment.

The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY] says: "Oh, it is because this code includes every rule which the people have asked for." How does he know? I do not see anything in these rules about a committee on committees, although I know of my personal knowledge that Members on your side of the House are pledged to their constituencies to vote for a committee on committees.

I can tell you why you gentlemen do not want this bill amended. It is because your solidarity would be destroyed the moment you had to go on a record vote on that question of a committee on committees. I have never spoken on the floor of this House in behalf of that particular provision in the rules, but I know that you gentlemen do not wish to meet that question, and you are in the same position which you have accused

us of being in so often. You do not dare to trust yourselves. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, this is as drastic a rule as the old rules that used to be brought in here. I have taken a good part, first and last, in general debate in this House, but every time I do so it is with increased reluctance, because I have come to the conclusion that general debate very rarely changes the situation on a bill. I had rather have two hours' debate, section by section, on this bill, or any other important bill, under the five-minute rule, with the privilege of offering amendments, than have eight hours of general debate.

I do not know how long I shall be here, but as long as I am here I intend to fight for the right to amend every section of every great bill which comes into this House, and I do not care a straw whether the Democrats control the House or the Republicans.

I am going to maintain that proposition as far as I am individually concerned.

The last time those words were spoken in this House I find in the RECORD these words:

Applause on the Democratic side.

But not one handclap do I hear at the present moment. [Laughter on the Republican side.] For the benefit of those of you who were not in the last Congress I inform you that I am reading from the eloquent speech made by the present Speaker of the House, the Hon. CHAMP CLARK. [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Oh, gentlemen, indeed the Speaker is no longer a czar when, after the terrific battle which he promised upon these occasions, he can not command a single vote on his own side! [Applause and laughter on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, on March 15, 1909, when there was a bitter controversy over the rules, I stated that if certain amendments then proposed by me were adopted the rules would be perfectly satisfactory to me. At that time I proposed amendments to eliminate what I considered to be the glaring abuses in the procedure of the House. After an exhaustive and careful investigation it was apparent to me that the abuses in the House were not due to the rules so much as to the abuse of power in their application and enforcement.

One of the amendments which I proposed provided for the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. The second provided that business in order on calendar Wednesday should not be set aside excepting by a two-thirds vote. The third provided that the right to recommit after the previous question had been ordered should be retained, and that the minority, or those in opposition to the bill, should have a preferential right to recognition in making that motion. The fourth provision was that the Committee on Rules should not report any rule which would deprive the minority or opposition of the right to move to recommit after the previous question had been ordered, or permit the setting aside of business in order on calendar Wednesday by less than a two-thirds vote.

Those amendments I then believed corrected every abuse in the procedure of the House, and the experience of the last two years has fully and completely demonstrated the accuracy of my contention.

Since then two important changes have been made in the rules. One was the elimination of the Speaker from the Committee on Rules and providing for its election by the House and the other was the so-called Motion to Discharge Calendar.

I favored the latter change, because I believed it would silence all criticism of committee designations and remove the cause of the charges that the committees of the House were packed for one or another purpose. I believed then as now that if an orderly method were provided by which bills might be taken from various committees upon the demand of a majority of the House it made no difference who appointed the committees so long as the House had complete control over its committees and opportunity to record its will in an orderly way.

These proposed rules, Mr. Speaker, retain all of the amendments proposed by me on March 15, 1909. I take it that now that the heat and passion have died out and the differences which grew up from that controversy have passed away, everybody will be willing to admit the accuracy of the statement I made at that time, that those amendments, known as the "Fitzgerald amendments," did effect useful, important, and drastic reforms in the procedure of the House, beneficial to the Members, helpful to legislation, and so satisfactory in their operation that no suggestion will be made in the near future to abandon them. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, one great satisfaction derived by me from this discussion is that no one has suggested that a single one of the reforms resulting from the "Fitzgerald amendments" be repudiated or that any of the amendments be changed in a fundamental respect.

Mr. Speaker, the rules now proposed dispose of the one other important matter regarding the rules about which there has been any controversy since March, 1909. That is the method of the selection of the committees by the House. I do not favor, and never have favored, the election of the committees. I am frank to say that, in my judgment, the power should be concentrated in the Speaker and the responsibility placed in him. I believe there should be no doubt as to the responsibility for the make-up of the committees.

But the Democrats in this House had a fair, open, and free discussion of that question in caucus. They determined otherwise than I believe most wise. As one who is a staunch advocate of party government, and I believe that the success and permanence of our institutions depends upon strong party government, I am perfectly willing to acquiesce in the determination of a majority of my party upon every question that does not involve such matters of principle upon which I could not conscientiously surrender my convictions to act in concert with others. This is not such a question. And so I am supporting the proposed rules with this change, providing for the election of the committees by the House, and taking the power to appoint them away from the Speaker.

These rules, however, go further. They provide that the chairman of the various committees shall be elected, so as to do away with the criticism that the Speaker's instruments or lieutenants are at the head of the committees having charge of the business upon the floor, to the injury of the rights of Members of the House. The provision is logical and demanded by the other change.

The rules contain another important provision. They provide that bills affecting the revenue shall not be open to amendments other than those germane to the subject matter contained in the bill. I suppose nobody upon the other side of the House will object to that change, since a Republican President has taken up and advocated the old Democratic proposition, first advanced by Mr. Springer, of Illinois, that the tariff should be revised by special bills affecting single schedules rather than in a general bill affecting all schedules of the tariff.

Mr. Speaker, the criticism indulged in by that side of the House has not been against the proposed rules, but it has been because opportunity has not been given Members upon that side to offer amendments to the rules. Personally, I should be willing to permit anyone to offer any amendment to any provision in the rules. I have always believed that any intelligent discussion of them would prevent very material changes. But no fundamental or important proposition has been suggested from that side of the House which should be incorporated in these rules; no really important change has been suggested, either to facilitate business or to protect individual Members; so that after all the criticism is merely of the form of procedure rather than the statement of a substantial grievance. The minority is given the right to propose and have voted upon, a code of rules in the form it would adopt if it were in the majority. It should have such opportunity. It is a privilege of much importance, and the order under which the House is proceeding gives such privilege. If not availed of, it will be because no really important change can be suggested.

The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. MADISON] regretted that we have not risen to the opportunity to strike the shackles from the Members of the House now that the opportunity is here. And yet the only amendment or proposition that he suggests should be adopted is one that would put a more powerful weapon in the hands of the majority than it ever has had in the past. [Applause on the Democratic side.] He wishes to give to this side of the House the right in Committee of the Whole on Calendar Wednesdays to close debate, to throttle the minority, and compel them to accept the good Democratic legislation which shall be on the calendars during this Congress. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

It gives me the greatest pleasure to learn that there are a number of gentlemen on that side of the House so convinced that this side intends to legislate for the benefit of the entire people that they are begging us to enact drastic rules to force such legislation down their throats and compel them to accept it even against their will. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] But the adoption of the proposed change would not be beneficial, but very harmful. Gentlemen either forget or do not know that one of the most important reasons for many of the proposed rules, as well as those which have been in force in the past, is to prevent the majority exercising its power in a drastic, tyrannical, and unjust manner. To adopt the suggestion of the gentleman from Kansas would be

to give the majority a power I should deplore if in the minority; and so I am unwilling to have it in the majority.

It is not true, as has been several times asserted, that the order under which the House is proceeding is the most drastic ever adopted by the House. Gentlemen on that side of the House known as insurgents joined the regulars and voted for a rule for the consideration of the postal savings bank bill which deprived the House of the right to appeal from the Speaker, whom they had denounced so viciously on so many previous occasions, merely because the bill happened to be one they favored. I have never been able to understand how the insurgent Republicans, after denouncing the Speaker of the House as a czar, as they had done so repeatedly, were willing to vote for a rule which would prevent even an insurgent Republican appealing from any decision which might be made by him during the consideration of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, criticism has been made of the Holman rule, which is incorporated in the proposed rules. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] referred to the fact that under the operation of that rule provisions were inserted in an appropriation bill in 1879, if I be not mistaken, by which the entire Federal supervisory election law was repealed, and yet he failed to recall that the Federal supervisory election law was enacted and placed on the statute books in the very same way, by being incorporated in an appropriation bill on June 10, 1872. It was the necessity of the situation which compelled the Democrats to get rid of that infamous measure, and they adopted the same method as had been adopted in order to enact it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Few Democrats will be worried by such an argument against the reviving of the rule. How shall expenditures exceeding a thousand million dollars a year be curtailed unless some method be devised by which wasteful expenditures, when found, may be eliminated? Those familiar with the parliamentary history of our Government, and who have given consideration to the existing political conditions, realize the necessity of utilizing the appropriation bills as the vehicles in which imperative reforms must be carried.

The complaint that was made 30 years ago, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, was not so much as to the usefulness and the operation of the Holman rule, but because of the condition that existed in the House prior to 1885, and which does not exist at this time.

Prior to 1885 the jurisdiction over all the appropriation bills was centered in the Committee on Appropriations. Those bills were so manipulated that with the Holman rule in force other committees having general legislative jurisdiction were deprived of an opportunity to be heard in the House, because legislation beyond the scope and intention of the rules was continually incorporated in all the appropriation bills.

Conditions now are different. The Military Committee has charge of the Army appropriation bill, the Naval Committee has charge of the naval appropriation bill, the Post Office Committee has charge of the Post Office appropriation bill, the Indian Committee has charge of the Indian appropriation bill, the Foreign Affairs Committee has charge of the diplomatic and consular appropriation bill, the Agriculture Committee has charge of the Agriculture appropriation bill. These committees not only have control of the appropriations for those various services, but they have jurisdiction of the legislation for the departments which expend the money. They should be given an opportunity in this coming Congress to demonstrate to the country the sincerity of this side of the House to cut out all useless and wasteful expenditure of the public money, and in this way alone, considering the political complexion of other branches of the Government, can it be done. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD]. [Applause.]

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, two years ago the Democratic Party and the insurgent or progressive Republicans stood for a change of the rules of this House. What was the change that we demanded? We demanded that the power of the Speaker to control the legislation of this House should be taken away from him. We recognized that as long as the Speaker of the House of Representatives had in his hands the power of recognition for private bills that each Member desired to put through, as long as he had the power to make up and absolutely control the Committee on Rules of this House, as long as he had the power to appoint the standing committees of this House, he had within his control as Speaker absolute power over the legislation of the American people. Against that power and against the exercise of it by the Speaker of the House of Representatives the Democratic Party made its protest. Against that power the progressive Republicans joined with us and made their protest. Now that was all there was in the fight. There was nothing else contemplated in the fight of two years

ago, and to-day, in these rules that are presented by the Democratic Party for the action of this House, every pledge and every promise that was made has been carried out by the Committee on Rules. [Applause on Democratic side.] What more can you ask; what more can your constituency ask? The power to run this House is to-day placed in the hands of the Members of the House. You elect a Committee on Rules that by your votes under a privileged motion you can discharge if they drop the legislation that the majority of the House desires.

Mr. MANN. Where is that provision?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Committee on Rules will be elected, when the proper time comes, by the membership of this House. They then become the officers of this House. It has never been questioned that it is the privileged right of any Member of this House to rise and move to turn any officer of this House out of his place, and I say that the same power will exist as to every committee of this House when these rules are adopted, and we elect them from the floor of the House instead of having them appointed by the Speaker. So that I say, that when you adopt these rules the power to control legislation in the House of Representatives is absolutely placed in the majority of this House, whether it be a partisan majority or not.

I have heard some gentlemen complain to-day that the right of absolute amendment has not been given here; that we have given four hours for general debate, and only propose to allow one substitute to be offered. Why, if that objection comes from the gentlemen on that side of the House who stand behind the distinguished gentleman from Illinois, and the position that he took two years ago, I have to say to them that two years ago when a real majority of this House desired to amend the rules they were not given the opportunity to offer a substitute. If it comes from the gentlemen who acted with us, the progressive or insurgent Republicans, I desire to call their attention to the fact that when we united to try and force an amendment of the rules two years ago, they recognized, and we recognized, that you could not amend a set of rules out on the floor of the House. And why? Because we did not propose, then, to bring the rules into the House for general amendment, recognizing that it required special attention to every word that you write in the rules and every paragraph that goes into the rules in order that business may be orderly conducted on the floor of the House; but they proposed, and we proposed, to elect a special Committee on Rules and give them the authority to revise the rules and report back to this House at the December session. So that every Republican who stood with us at that time recognized the impossibility of going into a general amendment of the rules on the floor. He recognized the necessity of having the changes of those rules carefully worked out by a committee.

Now, to-day we are going to do what you did not do two years ago or four years ago or six years ago, or since I have been a Member of this Congress. We are going to give you an opportunity absolutely to present to the House and to the country an entire change of rules from what we have proposed, to suit yourself. If you do not like the changes we have made in these rules, your leader can strike them out. He can present them to the House as he sees fit. He can have an absolutely fair vote and a roll call on his proposition, that we have been denied ever since I have been a Member of this House. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We have demonstrated to the country in the past two years and to-day that we wanted the representatives of the American people to control the legislation in this House. We have presented to you a set of rules by which the Speaker can no longer control the legislation of this House, where an opportunity will be given to any man that has a majority of this House behind him to write the law on the statute books that his constituency and the American people stand for. Can you ask for more than that? We do not say we will stop here. The Rules Committee is to be elected by this House. They are subject to be dethroned by this House. It is open to every Member of this House to go before them and present any proposition that he sees fit looking to a change of the rules. There is no man who has the right to assume to-day that that committee will not give him a fair hearing. There is no man who has the right to assume that that committee will not be responsive to the will of the majority of the representatives of the American people. [Loud applause.]

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I compliment and congratulate the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] and those behind him upon the resolution which he has presented providing for the rules of this House in this Congress. After all the cry which has resounded throughout the country for years, increasing in volume until it had affected a congressional election, after the people had been persuaded from one end of the land to the other that the old rules of the House were rules of tyranny and

not suitable for rules for a free people, the rules now proposed by the Democratic majority are substantially the rules of the last Republican House of Representatives.

There are 240 paragraphs in the rules as now proposed, and nearly all of these are identical in language with the rules which were in force while my distinguished colleague from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was the Speaker. Most of the actual changes which have been made relate to the committees.

It is proposed by these rules to abolish six of the committees of the House as they have existed for many years and to concentrate the power previously exercised by those committees in the other committees. We have had for many years a Committee on the Militia, which rendered important service and gave special study to the subjects relating to the National Guard. You propose to abolish that committee and concentrate its power in the already powerful Committee on Military Affairs.

You propose to abolish the Committee on Levees and Improvements of the Mississippi River, which has existed for many years, and to concentrate its power in the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

You propose to abolish the long-standing Committee on Pacific Railroads, which has rendered most important service in connection with Government-aided transcontinental railroads, and concentrate its power in the Committee on Railways and Canals.

With the same ruthless disregard of the manufacturing interests of the country, which leads you to oppose the American protective system, you propose to entirely abolish the Committee on Manufactures.

These changes are not in the interest of individual freedom in the House, but tend to the further concentration of power in the hands of the few. Although the committee rooms and the committee tables are now crowded with the present size of the large committees, you propose to increase the size of 15 of the leading committees of the House in order to provide additional places to satisfy the demands of your Democratic Members arising out of your new system of selecting committees through a party caucus. And in this connection, I wish to take a few moments in appealing to the Democratic side of the House to show some degree of fairness in dealing with the Republican minority as to committee assignments.

Every game must be played by fair rules, and even prize-fighters shake hands in advance and are barred from hitting below the belt. It is a rule in practice everywhere that a majority should in the preliminaries treat the minority fairly, and that has been the practice in the House, I believe, during the history of the Republic. You now propose to violate that practice.

You propose to increase the membership of 15 of the leading committees and take the increase for the majority. In the Fifty-third Congress, when the Democratic side of the House had a majority of 84, 20 more than it has in this House, although the total membership of the House was much less than it now is, you divided the great committees on the basis of 11 Democrats to 6 of the minority. With your great majority at that time you were still fair enough to give to the minority more than one-third. In this House you have a Democratic majority of 63. In the Sixtieth Congress, with a Republican majority of 58, we gave to you 7 Members to our 12 on most of these 15 committees.

In the last House, or the Sixty-first Congress, we had a majority of 47, only 16 less than you now have in this House, and we took 12 Members and gave you 7 on most of these leading committees, and on the Committee on Rivers and Harbors we took 12 and gave you 8.

You propose now to increase these 15 committees to a membership of 21 each and to take 14 and give to the Republicans only 7 on each committee. That is hitting below the belt.

Take the great Committee on Appropriations. In the Fifty-third Congress it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. That was a Democratic House. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. In the Fifty-ninth Congress, with a Republican majority of 116, it stood 11 majority to 6 minority. With your majority now of 63 you propose to make it 14 Democrats to 7 Republicans.

Take the great Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 8 places and gave to the minority 5. In the Republican Fifty-sixth Congress we took 10 places and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress we took 12 places and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 members and give us only 7.

Take the great Committee on Agriculture. In the Democratic Fifty-third Congress you took 11 members and gave the minority 6. In the Republican Fifty-fourth Congress, with over 130 majority, we took 11 members and gave you 7. In the last Con-

gress we took 11 members and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 and give us 7.

Take the important Committee on Foreign Affairs. In the Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 9 places and gave the minority 6. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 9 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-sixth Congress, with a small Republican majority, we took 10 places and gave the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority nearly as large as you now have, we took 12 places and gave you 7. You propose now to take 14 places and give us only 7.

Take the great Committees on Military Affairs and Naval Affairs. On each of those committees in the Democratic Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 9 and gave to the minority 6. In the Republican Fifty-sixth Congress we took 10 and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority of 47, we took 12 places and gave to the Democrats 7.

In this Congress, with a Democratic majority of 63, you propose to take 14 places and give to the minority only 7.

Take the great Committee on Ways and Means. In the Fifty-third Congress, with a Democratic majority of 84, you took 11 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-fourth Congress, with a Republican majority of over 130, we took 11 places and gave to the minority 6. In the Fifty-sixth Congress, with a Republican majority, we took 10 places and gave to the minority 7. In the Sixtieth Congress, with a Republican majority of 58, we took 12 places and gave to the minority 7. In the last Congress, with a Republican majority of 47, we took 12 places and gave you 7. You now, with a Democratic majority of only 63, propose to take 14 places and give to us only 7.

Heretofore, when there has been an increase in the size of committees, that increase has usually been divided between the majority and the minority parties. You propose now to make an increase and to take the increase for yourself. I appeal to the fairness of the gentlemen on the Democratic side in the hope that you will deal fairly by the minority as to committees.

You propose to increase the membership of 15 of these leading committees to 21. Their membership is now from 17 to 20, most of them at present having a membership of 19. This increase in numbers will involve a change of the furniture of every room which is occupied by these committees. The rooms and tables are now so arranged that one member can sit at each end of the table and the others have seats along the sides, and it does not take any more room for 22 members than for 21.

You have a membership in this House of 227 and the minority has a membership of 164. If you observe the traditional spirit of fairness which has prevailed in the past, both on the Democratic and Republican sides when they have respectively been in a majority, you will be willing now to give to the minority 8 members on each of these committees to your 14.

By the rules you have proposed you have increased the membership of these 15 committees by adding 35 new members to them, and you propose to take for the majority 33 of these new places and give to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BENSON], of the Socialist Party, one place and give to the Republican minority only one of the increased membership. You propose to take on these 15 committees 33 more places than we took when we were the majority, and give to us only one more place than we gave you when you were the minority.

You propose to abolish 6 committees which in the past have had a majority membership of 44 and a minority membership of 32. You propose to abolish, therefore, 32 minority committee places and 44 majority committee places, and add on other committees for the majority 33 new places and for the Republican minority only 1 new place. You propose to take a net loss on committee assignments of 11 places and give to the minority a net loss of 30 places.

The committees which you propose to increase in size are the Committees on Ways and Means, Appropriations, Judiciary, Banking and Currency, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Rivers and Harbors, Merchant Marine and Fisheries, Agriculture, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, the Post Office and Post Roads, Public Lands, Insular Affairs, and District of Columbia.

In the Fifty-ninth Congress there was a Republican membership of 250, and the Republicans took 179 places on these 15 committees. You now have a Democratic membership in this House of 227 and you propose to take 210 places on these 15 committees.

We all know that on most of these committees partisan questions seldom arise, and that it is just as important for the

country that the minority be well represented on the committee as for the majority to be. Nor have you anything to fear in regard to numbers. If we have been able to legislate with a majority of only 11 to 7, or 12 to 7, you certainly can carry out your plans with a committee majority of 14 to 8.

COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES.

Mr. Speaker, I understand why this unfair distribution of committee membership is now proposed. Under the rules which are now offered it is provided that the House shall elect its committees, and your side of the House heralds that as a great change of the rules. Why, sir, under the rules of the House for many years the House has had the power to elect its committees. There never has been a requirement in the rules that the Speaker appoint the committees if the House otherwise provided.

When your side of the House provided for the selection of committees by a Democratic caucus committee and caucus action it found what every party endeavoring to do the same thing will find, that it is necessary to increase the majority membership on the leading committees in order to pacify the demands which are made upon the individual members of the committee on committees in order to put your committee list through the caucus. And hence you generously provided to give to yourselves more places, but to deny them to us.

You say now that you have made a great change in the rules by providing for the election of committees. You propose, you say, to elect the committees in the House; but you do not propose to elect the committees by ballot; you do not propose to give to the individual membership of the House an opportunity to pass upon the qualifications of Members for committee assignments by either an open or secret ballot. What is the difference, pray, between having the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD], the Democratic floor leader, rise in his place and offer a resolution providing for the election of the gentlemen he names in the resolution as members of committees, which you have already named in your caucus, and having the Speaker of the House, as you could have done, say that the Speaker appoints the following committees which you had selected by your caucus action?

The idea which went through the land as to the selection of committees by a Committee on Committees was to have a committee of the House, where both sides were represented in the committee, select the membership of the various committees. You have eliminated that. You have simply provided a different method of carrying out your caucus action, which you could have carried out under the old rule with equal facility.

Under the old method of selecting committees by the Speaker every Member of the House was given an equal opportunity of expressing his wishes and desires and explaining his qualifications for committee assignments. The Speaker became the clearing house of information on the subject. He could consider not only the wishes of Members, but the interests of the public and of legislation and the geographic interests in representation, both of the majority and of the minority.

The Democratic caucus has already adopted its membership on the committees, and in general has accepted the Democratic committee assignments which were made by Speaker CANNON and former Speakers, thereby showing that you approve on the Democratic side of the House the action of the Speakers in making assignments in the past. You have turned over the selection of the Democratic members of committees to a caucus committee of 14 Democratic Members, which for weeks has been engaged, not so much in considering qualifications and suitability as in trading among themselves, in order to take care of personal friends and factional adherents.

The Republican caucus has decided that the recommendations for Republican assignments on committees shall be made by myself as the selected minority leader. I shall give consideration in my selections to the interests of the public as well as the desires and capabilities of the Members, their length of service in the House and on the committees, and their experience and qualifications.

Your method of selecting committees will inevitably lead to committees of unwieldy size and packed for political purposes through the influence of the brute power of factional majorities. You have failed entirely to meet the sentiment of the country, which you largely worked up through misleading statements, that committees of the House should be selected through a House committee on committees, composed of both majority and minority Members.

REPUBLICAN RULES.

For years you have been denouncing the rules of a Republican House. The Republicans were in power in this House for 16 consecutive years. During that time more wise legislation of a reform and progressive nature was enacted than during any other equal period in our country's history. Under the rules

of the House which were in force a membership of nearly 400 was enabled to reach those matters for consideration which the majority desired to consider without permitting a small minority to waste the time of the House considering legislation which the majority did not desire or propose to enact.

Rules of a large legislative body which enable the minority to fritter away the time only tend to prevent legislation, but the rules must provide some manner for protecting the right of the minority to be heard, both in opposition to measures which the majority proposes and in advocacy of measures which the minority propose and the majority do not take up. Such are the rules which have been in force in the past. You have denounced them as tyrannical, unworthy of free men, and subversive of individual freedom in the House. You made the country believe that our rules were rules of tyranny; that the Speaker was an autocrat and czar combined; that no bill could receive consideration in the House without first obtaining the consent of the Speaker. You have declaimed on the floor of the House and on the stump in the country that no Member in the House could be recognized to call up a bill without making previous arrangement with the Speaker; that no bill could receive consideration which the Speaker did not approve; that no bill could pass which did not bear the O. K. of the Speaker. You have frequently said on the Democratic side that the Speaker was the House and that the Members were merely attendants upon the Speaker, waiting to hear his will, because under the rules the power of the House and of its Members was lodged in the Speaker.

And yet, in the rules which you now propose, you have made no change which affects the power of the Speaker in giving recognition, or in affecting the consideration of measures to be brought before the House or actually brought up in the House. You acknowledge by your course that your charges and statements in the past were mere declamation; that the autocratic power of the Speaker under the former rules is a mere myth, and that the newspaper and magazine articles which have represented the Members of the House to be mere automatons, acting only when the Speaker pulled the wires, were mere fanciful stories, written by sensational writers who had never read the rules and were not familiar with the practices in the House.

CHANGES PROPOSED.

The truth is as to most of you on the Democratic side of the House that you have read and studied the rules now for the first time since you assumed responsibility as a majority. Upon reading and studying the rules you have found little to criticize and less to change.

I propose to discuss the changes which you have actually made in your proposed rules from the rules as heretofore existing. You have inserted as paragraph 3 of Rule XXI the following:

No amendment shall be in order to any bill affecting revenue which is not germane to the subject matter in the bill; nor shall any amendment to any item of such bill be in order which does not directly relate to the item to which the amendment is proposed.

Do you propose this as a new rule of parliamentary law? Why, every man who has even a rudimentary knowledge of parliamentary law knows that an amendment not germane to the subject matter of a bill was never in order under general parliamentary law, and yet you write it into your rules as a discovery. Is your knowledge of parliamentary law so lax that you do not know that an amendment not germane to the subject matter of the bill is not in order? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Then you provide that it can not be in order with respect to a particular item, unless it relates to the item. Since when did anyone think he could offer an amendment in order to any one item which did not relate to the item? [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.] Is that a Democratic discovery of parliamentary law? You have referred to this on the Democratic side as one of the important changes you propose in the rules. While this provision in the rules will do no harm, it will not change to the extent of the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" the parliamentary law as shown in the precedents from the time of Jefferson's Manual down to the present time.

You have another important amendment or change in your rules. You provide for the election by the House of a Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Documents. Has the attention of the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] never been called to the fact that the statute law provides for that committee and provides that the Speaker shall appoint the House members of it? [Laughter on the Republican side.] That committee has certain functions to discharge which are very important. It can authorize the destruction of papers in the departments. The committee must be appointed in conformity with the law, because when they discharge the

functions of the committee and authorize the destruction of papers, they may find that unless they are legally appointed they are guilty of a penitentiary offense for authorizing the destruction of official papers which can only be destroyed by authority of the law, and the law says the members on the House side shall be appointed by the Speaker. You say they shall be elected by the House.

Another one of the changes which you have made in the rules is to consolidate the rules providing for the consideration of the Private Calendar. A consolidation of those rules was undoubtedly desirable, and in practice they have been treated as consolidated for many years. But you will find when you come to work under the rule which you have adopted, being paragraph 6 of Rule XXIV, that you have not covered the case at all. Your new rule, unless you adopt a forced construction, omits to provide any method by which a bill reported by the Committee on the Whole to the House can be acted on in the House unless it is disposed of on the same day it is reported, and very often it is not possible to do that; and you have inadvertently changed the rule so as to cut out the consideration of bills reported from other committees when calling the calendar of bills reported from the Committee on Claims or the Committee on War Claims.

One other change you have proposed is by including as paragraph 2 of Rule XXI the so-called Holman rule, which undertakes to make in order on the general appropriation bill an amendment changing the existing law, if it shall retrench expenditures by the reduction of the number and salary of the officers of the United States, by the reduction of the compensation of any person paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or by the reduction of amounts of money covered by the bill.

This provision was adopted many years ago as one of the rules of a Democratic House, and after trying it and finding that it resulted not in the reduction of expenditures, but in the increase of expenses, it was left out of the rules of subsequent Democratic Houses as a dangerous rule, tending to provoke extravagance rather than economy. Under it an amendment will be in order providing for the reduction of an appropriation from \$100,000 to \$99,000, and requiring the department receiving the appropriation to render some service, which service may cost more than the entire appropriation, and which service, when authorized, will have to be cared for by a deficiency or subsequent appropriation.

This is authorized by the language of the rule, and, in fact, was the result of the working of the rule when in force in the past. Under this rule the Southern Railway mail subsidy, costing, I believe, \$250,000 a year, was originally provided for by proposing to reduce some appropriation for the Post Office Department a nominal amount and requiring the department to render the service. It took many years to abolish that subsidy, which became entrenched behind the power of the southern Members of Congress, whose districts were claimed to receive the benefit of it.

You have now proposed this rule through your lack of information, although your predecessors in Congress on your side of the House, when they were in power, discarded it after practice and threw it on the scrap heap. If you had been aware of its history you would not have now proposed it, but you found it in the rules of some Democratic House of the past, and with the innocence of ignorance and the infatuation of a novelty you seized it as a great Democratic rule, thinking that it had been thrown aside by a Republican House and unaware of the fact that it was a Democratic House which, after years of experience with the rule, had cut it out of the rules. But you will learn, for we are here to teach you.

COMMITTEE-DISCHARGE RULE.

One of the new rules which you brag most about is the committee-discharge rule, which reads as follows:

Any Member may present to the Clerk a motion in writing to discharge a committee from further consideration of any public bill or joint resolution which may have been referred to such committee 15 days prior thereto. All such motions shall be entered in the Journal and printed on a calendar to be known as a Calendar of Motions to Discharge Committees. Immediately after the Unanimous Consent Calendar shall have been called on any Monday it shall be in order to call up any such motion which shall have been entered at least seven days prior thereto. Recognition for such motions shall be in the order in which they have been entered. When such motion shall be called up the bill shall be read by title only prior to a second being ordered by tellers, and no such motion shall be entertained as to a bill or joint resolution the title of which contains more than 100 words; after the reading of the bill by title the motion shall not be submitted to the House unless seconded by a majority by tellers; if such motion falls of a second, it shall be immediately stricken from the calendar and shall not be thereafter placed thereon. If a second be ordered, debate on such motion shall be limited to 20 minutes, one-half thereof in favor of the proposition and one-half in opposition thereto. Such motions shall have precedence over motions to suspend the rules and shall require for adoption an affirma-

tive vote of a majority of the membership of the House. Whenever such a motion shall prevail the bill so taken from the consideration of a committee shall thereupon be placed upon its appropriate calendar, and upon call of the committee from which any bill has been so taken it may be called up for consideration by any Member prior to any bill reported by said committee at a date subsequent to the discharge of said committee: *Provided*, No Member shall have upon such calendar more than two motions at the same time.

In the last campaign you, on the Democratic side, told the people—and they believed you—that, under the rules of the House, it was a practice for committees to pigeonhole important bills and refuse to bring them before the House and give the House a chance to vote upon them. Under the old rules and under these proposed rules, every bill which is introduced is referred to a committee. You said that under our rules, if the committee was adverse to the bill, there was no method by which it could be brought before the House, and while I have frequently controverted that statement and have proven in the House by actual fact that there was a way of bringing a bill before the House, although the committee to which it had been referred was opposed to reporting it, yet I propose now only to consider this rule which you offer as a complete remedy for the evils which you have charged existed under the old rules.

In every set of rules adopted by a legislative body, it is important that there shall be a method by which the majority of the Members can bring before the legislative body for consideration and action any proposition which the majority desires to have considered. A legislative body like this House, composed of nearly 400 Members, can not afford to be held up by the small number of Members constituting a majority of one of its committees, and if there be no method by which a majority in the House can bring before the House for consideration a bill, notwithstanding the opposition of less than a dozen members on some committee to which the bill has been referred, then we are, indeed, lacking in virility and power.

I do not propose to discuss the methods which have existed in the past by which the majority could act, but to simply discuss this new rule which is offered as a panacea for all the evils. What does the rule provide? It is that if a committee declines or neglects to report a bill any Member may place upon the calendar a motion to discharge the committee from further consideration of the bill.

A somewhat similar rule was prepared in the last House by the distinguished gentleman who is now the Speaker of this House, and adopted by the House. I undertook to show the futility of that rule, and although there were placed upon the calendar in the last House in the neighborhood of 100 motions to discharge committees, the House never got past motion No. 1, which I filed. And the rule in the last House was no more a joke than the rule which is now proposed.

What does the rule propose to do? When your motion is on the calendar to discharge a committee, and you call it up, if it is ever reached, which very likely it never will be, you first have to have it seconded by a majority of all the Members present before it can be put to the House, and then when put to the House it must receive a favorable vote from a majority of the entire elected membership of the House. Considering the fact that on the Mondays when this calendar will be called there is seldom much more than a quorum of the House present, it is not likely that a majority of the membership of the House will often be found to vote for the motion, if there be sufficient opposition to a bill to have a committee refuse to report it. But suppose you have a motion, and it is reached on the call of the calendar, and the majority of the Members present second the motion and the majority of the Members-elect of the House vote for your motion, then what happens? Does the bill come before the House for consideration? Why, not at all. The bill goes on the calendar. Any bill which has been previously reported from the same committee has priority over your bill when the calendar is called. It is not likely that a House in its early days will discharge a committee from the consideration of a bill, because that might be considered unjust to the committee, and even unfair to the House, which is usually entitled to have the benefit of committee consideration first; and if the committee is not discharged until late in the Congress, the calendar will already be so full that there is scarcely any chance of the bill being reached for consideration in the House, even after the committee has been discharged.

You will note that the rule provides for the discharge of a committee from the further consideration of any "public bill or joint resolution." This does not include a simple House resolution. Suppose we should strike out the words "public" and "joint" and provide for the discharge of a committee from consideration of any bill or resolution. You could then introduce a resolution providing that on a certain day the House should

proceed to the consideration of a certain bill, whether it be in the hands of a committee, or whether it has been reported from a committee and is on the calendar. Such a resolution would be referred to the Committee on Rules. If you could move to discharge the Committee on Rules, you could bring that resolution before the House, and when adopted, if it should be, you would bring the bill itself up before the House for consideration; but the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY], who is to be the chairman of the Committee on Rules, in introducing these rules for adoption carefully provides that a simple House resolution referred to the Committee on Rules, his committee, shall be beyond the control of the House. You can not discharge the Committee on Rules under this new rule from the consideration of a resolution providing that the House shall proceed to consider and vote upon a pending bill or other proposition.

You can get at a bill now by going out to the document room and asking for it, and that is about as near as you can get to it under this new discharge rule. [Laughter on the Republican side.]

I may undertake to demonstrate if I choose, and I make no promises that I will not choose, to show the utter absurdity, not to say idiocy, of the rule that is now proposed. [Applause on the Republican side.]

You have denounced us for years, as well as the rules we adopted in Republican Houses, because we did not permit any individual Member at any time to waste the time of the House on motions to discharge committees. You have said that we were tyrants; that we were afraid; that we were unwilling to meet the issues. You made the public believe that you were sincere and in earnest; that you had a method by which any bill at any time could be brought before the House for consideration without unduly delaying the proceedings in the House. And now that you have the power you offer your remedy. It is a gold brick. It will not work to aid the majority, but you will find that even the rule that you have proposed can be used to annoy the majority. You will have the opportunity during this Congress to vote upon many motions to discharge committees from the further consideration of bills. You will have the responsibility of voting those motions up or down. You will find that the rule will not work efficaciously to produce any good results to the majority, but when we have tried the rule for some time on your majority the Democratic side of this House will be inclined to purchase a patent self-kicking machine, and furnish it to the distinguished gentleman from Texas in order that he may supply himself with what the other Democratic Members would like to give him.

The rule that you bring in on this subject, as well as the other changes in the rules, are mainly inspired through lack of experience and knowledge. With all the talk you have indulged in before the country, you have no more desire than any other majority in a legislative body has to deprive itself of the power to control legislation in the body where it is responsible. [Applause on the Republican side.] All the talk you have indulged in has been for the purpose of deluding the people and to get votes, and now that you have come into power you decline to put into effect the remedy which you have been talking about and talked for, lo, these many years.

I do not criticize you, but you have proven that you have not been sincere. Let us hope that when you come to real legislation, for which rules are only preliminary, you will be sincere.

Mr. Speaker, I have introduced a substitute, which is in terms and in language in effect the resolution offered two years ago by the present Speaker, the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK]. I do not intend myself to vote for it, but I want to have the pleasure of seeing the Democratic side of the House, then hailing and hurrahing for it, now voting against it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. Speaker, I have referred to all of the important changes which have been proposed in the rules. In the 240 paragraphs constituting the rules there is no other important change from the rules as existing in the House under Speaker CANNON.

RECOGNITION STILL REMAINS WITH THE SPEAKER.

Rule XIV still provides that "when any Member desires to speak, or deliver any matter to the House, he shall rise and respectfully address himself to 'Mr. Speaker,' and on being recognized may address the House." The autocratic power in the Speaker to recognize or not to recognize, which has been so ferociously denounced all over the country as a Cannon rule of tyranny, still remains in the identical language of the rule in force while Speaker CANNON presided over the House. I have heard Democrat after Democrat on this floor denounce this rule as depriving Members of their rights, and say that when the Democratic Party came into power in the House it

would no longer be left to the sweet will of the Speaker to recognize or refuse to recognize a Member, but that the Speaker would be required to recognize any Member who rose and asked for recognition. I have heard Members on the Democratic side of the House, while Mr. CANNON was Speaker, indignantly exclaim against the question so often put by the Speaker when the Member was asking for recognition, "For what purpose does the gentleman rise?"

Under this rule that same question will be frequently asked by Speaker CLARK, and I listen and wait in vain for any Member on the Democratic side to now object to the provision of this rule.

One other change you have made in the rules, however, and that is in regard to correspondents having the right in the press gallery. Heretofore press correspondents have had the right to use the press gallery under regulations practically prepared and enforced by the body of correspondents themselves. I notice in the rules now that this right is confined to "reputable reporters and correspondents." Who is to determine whether the correspondent is "reputable"? The Speaker? Is this arbitrary power given to the Speaker in addition to the powers which the Speaker has had heretofore? Why is an insinuation put in this rule that newspaper correspondents who have been favorably passed upon by the committee of the correspondents may not be reputable?

Mr. Speaker, I have now gone through the changes proposed by these new rules from the old rules. They are of little importance. There will be no substantial difference in the working practice of the new rules from the old rules. The House will be conducted in the same old manner. Proceedings will be had as heretofore. The precedents of the past will guide us in the future. The legislative mill will grind in the same manner in this Democratic House as it ground under Speaker CANNON in the Republican House. I have never denounced the tyranny of the rules or the tyranny of the Speaker. I have known full well that so long as the Speaker observed the rules he could not be a tyrant and that so long as the rules were observed they were not tyrannical.

I congratulate again the Democratic side of the House in now bringing before the House, after their study and consideration of the rules, practically the same rules that the Republicans had in force. I wish I could congratulate them on having the courage and the manliness to say to the public and to the House, "We had never studied the rules, because we did not have the responsibility, but when we did obtain responsibility, we studied the rules and we find that our charges against the old rules were unjustified; that they did not permit the Speaker to be a tyrant or a czar; that they did preserve individual liberty to the Members, and power to the House; and that we have not been able, after study of the subject, to make any manifest change in the rules or any practical betterment of them, and we apologize to Speaker CANNON and the Republican House for the misleading charges we hurled for years against him and the Republicans." [Loud applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] has seven minutes remaining.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, if there is anything "idiotic" and "farcical" in the rules as here proposed, it has certainly called forth from the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] the most doleful speech we have ever heard him deliver. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Permit me to remind his side of the House that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, of which he has been the distinguished chairman, was constituted in the Sixty-first Congress of 12 Republicans and 6 Democrats. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I did not think the gentleman would make wry faces if we gave him a homeopathic dose of his own medicine by adhering to the same proportion. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.] Many points made by the gentleman are not tenable, although he assumes to himself all knowledge of parliamentary law. He says that the amendment in regard to revenue measures is not good and that we have acted as if we had discovered something new. Let me say to him, if the amendment is satisfactory to his side, it suits us over here. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The ex-Speaker of the House winced because I politely alluded to the fact that prior to his administration of that great office no Speaker's decision had ever been overruled. I regret these things did occur while he was the Speaker of the House, and am satisfied now he regrets that such record fell to his lot.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I have not the time.

Mr. CANNON. It is only to correct a statement.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Then I will yield.

Mr. CANNON. The books are full of instances where many other Speakers were repeatedly overruled.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. My remarks were only a quotation from Thomas B. Reed, the accuracy of which is left to rest with his speech and memory. Now, Mr. Speaker, the ex-Speaker also said, "You have taken the power of appointing committees away from the Speaker and vested it in the Committee on Rules," and added, "This House must drive the Committee on Rules to make it conform to its views." That is not a bad proposition. 'Tis well! It is much better than when the distinguished gentleman from Illinois carried the "bait gourd" and appointed the committees and Members were compelled to do obeisance to his will. [Applause on the Democratic side.] This is a different story. Let me say that although he has said the epithet of "czar" may be transferred from the Speaker's chair to the floor of this House and applied to my humble self, I hope no such unhappy fate may ever befall me. In so far as I am individually concerned, whenever the majority of this House, which has elected the Committee on Rules, gives their command to bring in a rule to conform to their will a ready response will be found. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Yes; the American people demanded that we should take power away from the Speaker and restore it to the membership. They decreed that we should elect the committees. That is where the power belongs, and our Speaker consented to it.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman complains of the retrenchment provision placed in the new rules. They have gone back and dug up ancient history. Let me say to you gentlemen that some of the most important matters of legislation ever passed through legislative bodies have been on appropriation measures. Riders have been placed on such bills, shaking the foundation of kingdoms and republics! We have only enlarged and restored the power of appropriation to the representatives of the people, fresh from their constituents, bearing the banner of economy for the good of the whole country. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

And while the President of the United States is a Republican, and the Senate is controlled by the Republican Party, thanks to popular approval this House has been commissioned to retrench and economize and save the people's money. And when the final chapter of the history of this Congress has been written it will perpetuate the living truth that we have saved the American people millions of dollars. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, if there are any other amendments necessary at a later day, they will be added in behalf of the country. At present we are ready and willing to indorse this work and now invite the formal vote. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. Under the order adopted by the House the vote will first be taken on the substitute.

The question was taken, and the substitute was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is now on agreeing to the resolution offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. HENRY of Texas, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules just adopted be printed (Order No. 1).

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules just adopted be printed. Is there objection?

Mr. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know how they will be distributed.

Mr. MANN. Let me suggest to the gentleman from Alabama that under the law as now provided for if documents of this kind are ordered the document room will have liberty to increase the number and order as many copies as are necessary.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. I understand that, but I wanted to be understood by Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that 1,000 copies of the rules as adopted be printed. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make one more request, and that is that Members be allowed five legislative days in which to print on the subject of the rules.

The SPEAKER. Is that to apply to all Members or to Members who spoke upon the rules to-day?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. To all Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that all Members have five legislative days within which to print remarks in the Record on the subject of the rules. Is there objection?

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Speaker, would that give to a Member who has spoken the right to extend his remarks?

Mr. HENRY of Texas. Oh, certainly.

Mr. KENDALL. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to inquire if it is the purpose of the gentleman from Texas to allow everybody to print remarks in the Record upon this proposition?

Mr. MANN. That is the request.

Mr. HENRY of Texas. That is the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas objects.

Mr. MANN. Then, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record on the subject of the rules. The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. POUL. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. STANLEY. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. HARDWICK. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. FOSTER of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

Mr. OLMSTED. I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. POUL], the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HARDWICK] ask unanimous consent to extend their remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all gentlemen who have spoken be permitted to extend their remarks in the Record for five legislative days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that all gentlemen who spoke on the question of the rules shall have five legislative days in which to print on that subject. Is there objection?

There was no objection, and it was so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] will give me his attention a moment, it occurs to me that there is no doubt but that a motion permitting gentlemen to print on this subject would be in order, and a majority could agree to give them the opportunity to print on the subject of the rules unless there is a demand for the regular order. We have now got rules. Such a motion of course could be cut off by a demand for the regular order. The regular order, of course, is to clear the Speaker's table.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, in order to simplify the situation, I demand the regular order.

MESSENGER TO SPEAKER'S TABLE.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 31.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of \$1,200 for the services of a messenger to be appointed by the Speaker to serve at the Speaker's table, said office to be in lieu of the messenger at the Speaker's table at \$1,200 per annum, office of the Doorkeeper, as now authorized.

Resolved, That the Speaker shall control the appointment and removal of the messenger at the Speaker's table, the salary of which is provided for in the legislative, executive, and judicial appropriation act, under the office of the Doorkeeper.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the resolution provide that the Speaker shall have authority to appoint an official which the law provides shall be appointed some other way?

Mr. LLOYD. The sole purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Speaker to appoint a messenger at his table.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I have no objection.

Mr. LLOYD. Under existing law the messenger at the Speaker's table is appointed by the Doorkeeper.

Mr. MANN. I suggest to the gentleman, after all, I did not intend to say anything about it, it would be better to provide privately that the Speaker direct the Doorkeeper to discharge that clerk, because the law provides the Doorkeeper shall make that appointment.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The appointment by the Speaker, until the law has been changed, will not give the person designated the salary, which is the important thing.

Mr. LLOYD. This provides that the salary which is now allowed to a messenger at the Speaker's table under existing law shall be given to him when appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman can not do that by resolution of the House; provide that what the law provides shall be paid to a person designated in one way shall be paid to a person designated in another way.

Mr. BARTLETT. Mr. Speaker, there is no trouble about the matter, it occurs to me, if the resolution provides that until further provided for the messenger who shall be appointed by the Speaker shall be paid out of the contingent fund. I think it will meet all requirements of the law, because under the precedents, under rulings of the Comptroller of the Treasury time and time again, it has been held that the House has absolute control over its contingent fund, and if this resolution provides for the payment of a messenger to the Speaker's table, to be paid out of the contingent fund until provided for by law, and the Doorkeeper does not appoint some one to take the place of the man whom the Doorkeeper is authorized to reappoint, there will be no one to draw the salary, and it will lapse into the Treasury, so that while you can not change the law by a resolution you can provide for the payment of money out of the contingent fund for any purpose that the House sees fit to pay.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be reported again.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I wish the resolution to be read in the form in which I have just modified it.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the modified resolution.

Mr. MANN. The other resolution is before the House. Unless the gentleman withdraws it—

Mr. LLOYD. I wish to withdraw the other resolution, and I offer the modified one.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the modified resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:
Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of \$1,200 per annum for the services of a messenger to be appointed by the Speaker to serve at the Speaker's table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The question was taken, and the resolution was agreed to.

JOHN T. CHANCEY.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:
Resolved, That John T. Chancey be continued in the service of the House of Representatives in his present position during the Sixty-second Congress at his present compensation.

[Applause.]
Mr. CULLOP. Mr. Speaker, I ask to have the resolution reported again.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, that position is already provided for under the law. The resolution is not necessary.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will again report the resolution. The resolution was again reported.

Mr. BARTLETT rose.
The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DALZELL] yield to the gentleman from Georgia?

Mr. DALZELL. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. BARTLETT. I have no desire, and do not intend, to oppose the proposition to continue this man, whom I know; but if the gentleman will examine the legislative bill he will find that this employee is carried on the rolls of the House until 1912 at his present salary, and this resolution might be a recognition of some authority somewhere to remove. He is an employee of the House, originally specified in a resolution, and has been continued for a great many years under the original resolution and carried in every appropriation bill since.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, if it is unnecessary, of course I do not care to press it. I withdraw the resolution.

JOURNAL CLERK.

Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution. The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of \$1,000 per annum for the services of a journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent for that?

Mr. LLOYD. Yes.
Mr. FITZGERALD. The law does provide for the compensation of a journal clerk.

Mr. LLOYD. The law provides for the payment of a journal clerk, but the law also provides that the journal clerk shall be appointed by the Clerk, and the purpose of this resolution is to authorize the Speaker to appoint the journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The resolution does not provide by whom the clerk shall be appointed at all.

Mr. LLOYD. This resolution provides that the Speaker shall appoint the journal clerk.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I suggest that it go over. Provision is made for it by law.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. LLOYD] to the fact that this resolution does not provide that the journal clerk shall be appointed by the Speaker.

Mr. MANN. Let it go over, and take time to consider it.
Mr. LLOYD. Mr. Speaker, for the present I withdraw the resolution.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence indefinitely, on account of sickness.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until Thursday, April 6, 1911, at 12 o'clock m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Newport News Creek, Va. (H. Doc. No. 5); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of examination of Dabob Bay, Wash. (H. Doc. No. 4); to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors and ordered to be printed.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1610) to extend to the veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars and to the widows of veterans of the several Seminole Indian wars the benefits of the act of Congress of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1611) to prohibit the receipt of money in payment of special taxes as dealers in intoxicating liquors by internal-revenue officials of the United States, except in certain cases, and to provide punishments for its violation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1612) granting pensions to the soldiers of the different Seminole Indian wars and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1613) to extend the provisions of the existing bounty-land laws to the officers and enlisted men and the officers and men of the boat companies of the Florida Seminole Indian wars; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1614) to prescribe the terms of office of collectors of internal revenue; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1615) for the relief of the State of Florida; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1616) to provide for the erection of a sub-treasury building and the establishment of a subtreasury at Jacksonville, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1617) to provide for a trial by jury of persons charged with contempt of court; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 1618) amending paragraph 6 of the act relating to the Metropolitan police force; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1619) for the relief of certain retired officers of the Navy and Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH: A bill (H. R. 1620) to prevent the nullification of State antislavery laws by international or interstate transmission of race-gambling bets or of racing odds; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1621) for the refunding of the cotton tax; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PALMER (by request): A bill (H. R. 1622) granting pensions to soldiers who served 90 or more days in the Philippines and were honorably discharged for disability; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1623) to establish the University of the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1624) to erect a monument to the memory of John Summerfield Staples at Stroudsburg, Pa.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1625) providing for the purchase of an oil painting entitled "The death of Brevet Lieutenant-Colonel Alonzo H. Cushing;" to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1626) to amend sections 5136 and 5137 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, known as the "national-bank act;" to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. SMITH of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1627) to repeal the duty on lumber; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 1628) authorizing an increase in expenditure for the purchase of a post-office site at Fordyce, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1629) making it unlawful to falsify any memorandum, enumeration, report, or tabulation relating to the census; to the Committee on the Census.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1630) authorizing the Independent Order of B'nai B'rith of the United States to occupy and construct buildings for the use of the organization on lots Nos. 3 and 4, Block No. 114, in the city of Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1631) to prohibit interference with commerce among the States and Territories and with foreign nations, and to remove obstructions thereto, and to prohibit the transmission of certain messages by telegraph, telephone, cable, or other means of communication between States and Territories and foreign nations; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1632) providing for the enlargement, improvement, and repair of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1633) to authorize and provide for the investigation and survey of swamp, wet, and overflowed lands in the Mississippi Valley susceptible of drainage, and to devise plans and systems therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1634) authorizing the construction of a post-office building at Stuttgart, Ark.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 1635) for the construction of a memorial and mortuary chapel in the Arlington National Cemetery; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: A bill (H. R. 1636) for the erection of a monument to the memory of Brig. Gen. Nathaniel Lyon at St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on the Library.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1637) authorizing an appropriation for the Interparliamentary Union for International Arbitration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1638) providing for the protection of the interests of the United States in lands and waters comprising any part of the Anacostia River, or Eastern Branch, and lands adjacent thereto, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1639) directing the Secretary of War to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to sublots 31, 32, and 33 of original lot 3, square No. 80, in the city of Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1640) to convey the outstanding legal title of the United States to lots 3 and 4, square 103; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: A bill (H. R. 1641) authorizing the Connecticut River Co. to construct a dam or dams across the Connecticut River above the village of Windsor Locks, in the State of Connecticut; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 1642) establishing a standard gauge for sheet and plate iron and steel; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1643) to give religious and charitable publications the benefit of the second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1644) granting the public lands belonging to the United States and situated in the State of Missouri to the State of Missouri for the use and benefit of the common schools of that State; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1645) to extend the provisions of the pension acts of June 27, 1890, and of February 6, 1907, respectively, to all State militia and other organizations that were organized for the defense of the Union and cooperated with the military or naval forces of the United States in the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1646) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes," approved August 5, 1909; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOORE of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1647) to amend an act entitled "An act to increase the limit of cost of certain public buildings, to authorize the purchase of sites for public buildings, to authorize the erection and completion of public buildings, and for other purposes;" to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1648) for the erection of a Federal building for the post office at Navasota, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1649) to provide for a public building at Huntsville, Tex.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1650) to provide for the selection of a site for the establishment of a navy yard, dry dock, and naval training station on or near Morgans Point, in San Jacinto Bay, in the State of Texas; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1651) to establish a subtreasury at Houston, Tex.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1652) supplementary to and amendatory of the act entitled "An act for the division of the lands and funds of the Osage Nation of Indians in Oklahoma," approved June 28, 1906, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 1653) making the 12th day of October in each year a legal holiday; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1654) to amend the law of patent designs; to the Committee on Patents.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1655) to acquire the manuscript of Charles Chaillé Long, containing an account of the unveiling of the McClellan statue; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 1656) providing for the extension of the provisions of the pension act of June 27, 1890, to the Seventy-second Regiment Enrolled Missouri Militia; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1657) to amend an act to authorize the employment of volunteers to aid in enforcing the laws and protecting public property, approved March 3, 1863; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1658) to amend the act of June 27, 1890, as amended by the act of May 9, 1900; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1659) to amend sections 2 and 3 of the act of June 27, 1890, in relation to pensions, etc.; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1660) establishing the Wilson Creek National Military Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1661) providing for an amendment to section governing the compensation of registers and receivers of United States land offices; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1662) to amend chapter 90, Twenty-fourth Statutes at Large, page 373, approved February 3, 1887, and fixing term of office of electors of President and Vice President of the United States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. THOMAS: A bill (H. R. 1663) to correct the military record and provide for the granting of pensions to survivors of certain battalions of Kentucky Militia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1664) to regulate the sale of unstemmed leaf tobacco in the hand; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1665) for the benefit of railway postal clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1666) establishing the Mammoth Cave National Park; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1667) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 1668) to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by requiring the use of the block system by common carriers engaged in interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 1669) to create in the War and Navy Departments a roll to be known as the volunteer retired list, to authorize placing thereon with retired pay certain surviving officers of the United States Volunteer Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of the Civil War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FORNES: A bill (H. R. 1670) to amend section 657 of the Code of Laws for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1671) to provide a suitable memorial to the memory of the North American Indian; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 1672) to construct a Lincoln memorial highway from the White House, Washington, D. C., to the battle field of Gettysburg, in the State of Pennsylvania; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TALBOTT of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 1673) requiring the Washington, Spa Springs & Getta Railroad Co. and the Washington Railway & Electric Co. to issue free transfers for passengers using their lines; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 1674) to provide for enlarging and improving the United States building at Evansville, Ind.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1675) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below mouth of Wabash River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1676) to establish a fish-cultural station in the State of Indiana; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. LATTA: A bill (H. R. 1677) for the restoration of annuities to the Medawakanton and Wahpakoota (Santee) Sioux Indians, declared forfeited by the act of February 16, 1863; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 1678) providing for taxation of and fixing the rate of taxation on inheritances, devises, bequests, legacies, and gifts in the District of Columbia, and providing for the manner of payment as well as the manner of enforcing payment thereof; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 1679) to accept the cession by the State of Montana of exclusive jurisdiction over the lands embraced within the Glacier National Park, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 1680) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to apply a portion of the proceeds derived from the sale of its sewer bonds to the purchase of the sewer system of the Phoenix Sewer & Drainage Co., in said city; to the Committee on the Territories.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 1681) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 1682) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct bridges across the San Carlos and Gila Rivers on the White Mountain or San Carlos Indian Reservation, in the Territory of Arizona, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1683) to enable the city of Phoenix, in Maricopa County, Ariz., to issue its bonds for the purpose of constructing buildings for the housing of its fire department, equipping its fire department, and constructing and installing a fire-alarm system in said city; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1684) to authorize and empower the town of Glendale, Maricopa County, Ariz., to issue its bonds in the sum of \$10,000, for the purpose of providing \$8,000 for the improvement of its streets and \$2,000 for the purchase of an apparatus for extinguishing fires; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1685) to establish a fish-culture station in the Territory of Arizona; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1686) to enable the town of Tempe, in the County of Maricopa, Territory of Arizona, to issue its municipal bonds for the purpose of acquiring an electric-light and power plant for the use of the inhabitants of said town; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1687) to enable the board of supervisors of the county of Mohave, in the Territory of Arizona, to issue the bonds of said county in the sum of \$60,000 to construct and furnish a courthouse and to grade and improve the courthouse grounds; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1688) to enable the town of Tempe, in the County of Maricopa, Territory of Arizona, to issue its municipal bonds for the purpose of erecting a city hall for the use of the inhabitants of said town; to the Committee on the Territories.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1689) providing for the sinking of experimental artesian wells in the Territory of Arizona; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1690) to provide pensions for prisoners of war; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK of Florida: A bill (H. R. 1691) to revive and amend an act to provide for the collection of abandoned property and the prevention of fraud in insurrectionary districts within the United States and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCALL: A bill (H. R. 1692) in amendment of the act of June 25, 1910, providing for publicity of contributions made for the purpose of influencing elections at which Representatives in Congress are elected; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LEGARE: A bill (H. R. 1693) to establish a fish-cultural station near Walterboro, Colleton County, in the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 1694) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish one condemned cannon to the Appleton City Academy, Appleton City, Mo.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 1695) to amend an act entitled "An act granting to certain employees of the United States the right to receive from it compensation for injuries sustained in the course of their employment," approved May 30, 1908; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAY: A bill (H. R. 1696) to decrease the expense and increase the efficiency of the staff service of the Army; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1697) to regulate the selection of lieu lands by railroads in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1698) to amend section 6 of an act entitled "An act to regulate commerce," approved February 4, 1887, and acts amendatory thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1699) providing that certain soldiers and sailors who served in the United States Army and Navy or Marine Corps during the Civil War, the War with Spain, or the Philippine insurrection for 90 days shall have a preference right in making entry on the public lands of the United States hereafter opened to settlement; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1700) to provide for the purchase of a site and the erection of a building thereon at Oregon City, in the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1701) to authorize the establishment of a life-saving station at the mouth of the Siuslaw River, Oreg.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1702) providing for the manner of making payment for water rights under the reclamation act of June 17, 1902; to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1703) to provide pensions for the officers and soldiers of the Indians wars of the United States which occurred prior to the year 1880; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1704) to further amend section 2276 of the Revised Statutes of the United States; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1705) to provide for reserving from the public lands in the State of Oregon as a public park for the benefit of the people of the United States, and for the protection and preservation of the game, fish, timber, and all other natural objects therein a tract of land herein described, etc.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 1706) to improve the navigation in the Connecticut River between Hartford and Holyoke; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 1707) for an investigation by the Geological Survey of the water resources of the Red River Basin; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1708) directing the Office of Public Roads of the Agriculture Department to advise and cooperate with State and local authorities as to the best methods of maintaining roads used as rural routes in passable condition, and to inspect and report the condition of said roads with recommendations to the Post Office Department whenever requested by it to do so; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1709) for the establishment of a fish hatchery in the State of Texas; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 1710) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1711) providing for the construction of a dredge boat to be used upon the Ohio River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1712) authorizing a survey of Tradewater River, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1713) for dredging and removing sand bars in Ohio River, near Hawesville and Uniontown, Ky., and near the mouth of Green River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1714) authorizing a survey of Pond River, Ky., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1715) for the construction of a lock and dam in the Ohio River below the mouth of Green River; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1716) for the erection of a cold-storage warehouse in Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1717) requiring a more complete record of all unmanufactured tobaccos; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1718) providing for the sale of the old Federal building and site at Owensboro, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1719) for the relief of the drafted men of Henderson County, Ky., and other counties of Kentucky; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1720) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1721) for the relief of farmers and tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1722) relating to punishment for contempt in Federal courts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1723) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1724) to admit free of duty certain articles manufactured in the United States of America; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1725) for the erection of a public building at Hopkinsville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1726) for the relief of farmers, merchants, and other dealers in leaf tobacco; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1727) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to conduct experiments and determine the practicability of making paper material out of cornstalks, and to erect buildings and purchase apparatus therefor; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1728) to establish a fish-hatching and fish-cultural station in Christian County, in southwestern Kentucky; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1729) to prohibit persons engaged in the manufacture and sale of railroad cars, locomotives, railroad rails, and structural steel, or in the mining and sale of coal from becoming directors or other officers or employees of railroads engaged in interstate commerce; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1730) for the erection of a public building at Madisonville, Ky.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1731) for the relief of tobacco growers; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1732) to prevent the use of coupons and other devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1733) placing licorice and licorice paste, etc., on the free list; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 1734) to locate a sub-treasury at Savannah, Ga.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 1735) in amendment of section 2 of an act entitled "An act to increase the pensions of widows, minor children, etc., of deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War, the War with Mexico, the various Indian wars, etc., and to grant a pension to certain widows of the deceased soldiers and sailors of the late Civil War"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1736) granting pensions to certain enlisted men, soldiers and officers, who served in the Civil War and the War with Mexico; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 1737) to amend section 1 of an act approved January 30, 1897, entitled "An act to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors to Indians, providing penalties therefor, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. LENROOT: A bill (H. R. 1738) to create a Tariff Commission and defining its powers and duties; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BURNETT: A bill (H. R. 1739) to amend section 4875 of the Revised Statutes, to provide a compensation for superintendents of national cemeteries; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 1740) to grant to soldiers pensioned on account of wounds received in battle the same rate of pension to which they would be entitled on account of old age under the act of February 6, 1907; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1741) to prevent the manufacture or use of dishonest or fraudulent weighing or measuring appliances in commercial transactions; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1742) to amend sections 3536 and 3548 of the Revised Statutes in regard to the standard weight of coins; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PAYNE: A bill (H. R. 1743) to create a Tariff Board; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1744) to change the date of the regular annual session of Congress to March 4 or 5, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1745) to amend the revenue laws so as to provide for furnishing certified copies of certain records to officers and other persons; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NORRIS: A bill (H. R. 1746) amending section 2 of the act of Congress approved August 5, 1909, entitled "An act to provide revenue, equalize duties, and encourage the industries of the United States, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MAYS: A bill (H. R. 1747) to provide for the erection of a public building at the city of Marianna, in the State of Florida; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. DAVENPORT: A bill (H. R. 1748) for the relief of the Miami Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 1749) directing the Secretary of War to ascertain the amount of money expended by the State of Texas between January 1, 1866, and December 31, 1876, inclusive, and report the same to Congress for its consideration; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1750) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the adjudication and payment of claims arising from Indian depredations," approved March 3, 1891; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 1751) to make October 12 of each and every year a public holiday in the District of Columbia, to be known as "Columbus Day"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1752) for the erection of a public building at the city of Taylorville, in the State of Illinois, and appropriating money therefor; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1753) amending section 3 of an act entitled "An act granting pensions to soldiers and sailors who are incapacitated for the performance of manual labor, and providing for pensions to widows, minor children, and dependent parents," approved June 27, 1890; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COX of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 25) calling on the President of the United States for a statement of Philip-

pine expenses; to the Committee on Expenditures in the War Department.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Resolution (H. Res. 26) for facilitating the distribution of public documents; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. STANLEY: Resolution (H. Res. 27) requesting the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 28) requesting the President, if not incompatible with the public interest, to furnish the House with certain information; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, resolution (H. Res. 29) to investigate violations of the antitrust act of 1890; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BERGER: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 29) relative to the Mexican situation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BARTHOLOMEW: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 30) in reference to the employment of enlisted men in competition with local civilians; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 31) concerning the manuscript prepared by Charles Chaillé Long, containing an account of the proceedings at the unveiling of the statue of the late Maj. Gen. George B. McClellan; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRIEST: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 32) directing the Commission on Universal Peace to report upon a plan for commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, joint resolution (H. J. Res. 33) creating a commission to consider and report upon a plan for the promotion of universal peace among nations by commemorating the one hundredth anniversary of the signing of the treaty of Ghent; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BOEHNE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 34) authorizing the Chief of Engineers of the United States Army to prepare plans and specifications for docks in certain cases; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. TRIBBLE: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 35) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. HAWLEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 37) requesting the President of the United States to renew negotiations with the Government of Russia to secure for American missionaries in Russia the same rights enjoyed by Russian missionaries in the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 38) to grant authority to the American Red Cross to erect temporary structures in Potomac Park, Washington, D. C.; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. RUCKER of Missouri: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 39) proposing an amendment to the Constitution providing that Senators shall be elected by the people of the several States; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, asking Congress to make provision for the calling of a constitutional convention to amend the Constitution to prohibit polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Memorial of the Legislature of Ohio, concerning the law against polygamy; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. EDWARDS (by request): A bill (H. R. 1754) for the relief of the Georgia Railroad & Banking Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1755) for the relief of the legal representative of James Doyle; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 1756) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1757) granting an increase of pension to Anderson Weese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1758) granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. York; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1759) granting an increase of pension to Reuben S. Weldon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1760) granting an increase of pension to David B. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1761) granting an increase of pension to James T. Vincent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1762) granting an increase of pension to James Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1763) granting an increase of pension to John Travis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1764) granting an increase of pension to John B. Thompson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1765) granting an increase of pension to Edwin Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1766) granting an increase of pension to O. A. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1767) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Sheridan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1768) granting an increase of pension to James D. Ramey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1769) granting an increase of pension to George Russell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1770) granting an increase of pension to Oscar M. Peck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1771) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1772) granting an increase of pension to Elbert Nugent; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1773) granting an increase of pension to John T. Norris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1774) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Kepler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1775) granting an increase of pension to James A. King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1776) granting an increase of pension to William E. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1777) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dixon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1778) granting an increase of pension to James Dodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1779) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1780) granting an increase of pension to R. R. Dill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1781) granting an increase of pension to William P. Camp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1782) granting an increase of pension to Michael Coplinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1783) granting an increase of pension to Jonathan C. Crane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1784) granting an increase of pension to Moses Callison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1785) granting an increase of pension to Henry Bedwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1786) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bull; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1787) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1788) granting an increase of pension to Mahlon N. Boardman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1789) granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1790) granting an increase of pension to W. M. Jolly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1791) granting an increase of pension to James C. Haden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1792) granting an increase of pension to Logan Hughes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1793) granting an increase of pension to John W. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1794) granting an increase of pension to James Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1795) granting an increase of pension to Solon B. Hale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1796) granting an increase of pension to William B. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1797) granting an increase of pension to J. D. Ginger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1798) granting an increase of pension to E. E. Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1799) granting an increase of pension to Elisha Enox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1800) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Blackledge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1801) granting an increase of pension to James A. Ellison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1802) granting a pension to Tazwell T. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1803) granting a pension to B. F. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1804) granting a pension to Mary Wehrmann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1805) granting a pension to W. K. Whitaker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1806) granting a pension to James M. Wilkerson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1807) granting a pension to Fred Wakefield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1808) granting a pension to Levi Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1809) granting a pension to Mary M. Varble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1810) granting a pension to Malissa R. Vaughn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1811) granting a pension to Marion Vest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1812) granting a pension to W. L. Sharp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1813) granting a pension to Amanda Sexton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1814) granting a pension to Dora Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1815) granting a pension to Jesse G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1816) granting a pension to Paris G. Strickland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1817) granting an increase of pension to Henry G. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1818) granting a pension to John Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1819) granting a pension to James W. Scott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1820) granting a pension to Narcissa E. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1821) granting a pension to Mary A. Runyan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1822) granting a pension to Thomas F. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1823) granting a pension to Joseph L. Young; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1824) granting a pension to I. T. Robinson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1825) granting a pension to Nicholas Potter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1826) granting a pension to Sophrone Pursley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1827) granting a pension to Sarah F. Preston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1828) granting a pension to Thomas Payne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1829) granting a pension to Keziah Phlegly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1830) granting a pension to Solomon Perkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1831) granting a pension to William F. Neet; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1832) granting a pension to A. A. McAllister; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1833) granting a pension to James G. Munday; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1834) granting a pension to O. A. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1835) granting a pension to James McCabe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1836) granting a pension to Glenn A. Means; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1837) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1838) granting a pension to Lucy F. Melton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1839) granting a pension to Samuel Moser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1840) granting a pension to Henry B. Meyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1841) granting a pension to Fay Milligan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1842) granting a pension to Ella Mansell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1843) granting a pension to Conrad F. Korthanke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1844) granting a pension to Jefferson Knaus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1845) granting a pension to Vina Lindenhower; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1846) granting a pension to Joseph T. Kerby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1847) granting a pension to Helena Koeser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1848) granting a pension to Louis Legune; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1849) granting a pension to A. N. Day; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1850) granting a pension to James J. Davison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Richard L. Drumwright; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1852) granting a pension to George W. Drake; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1853) granting a pension to J. G. Dollison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1854) granting a pension to Solomon Coan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1855) granting a pension to James T. Calvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1856) granting a pension to George W. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1857) granting a pension to John I. Chapman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1858) granting a pension to Tim Clifford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1859) granting a pension to Joseph Caton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1860) granting a pension to John B. Clements; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1861) granting a pension to Samuel M. Coleman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1862) granting a pension to John R. Cropp; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1863) granting a pension to Benjamin F. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1864) granting a pension to Edwin W. Bretz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1865) granting a pension to George T. Beal; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1866) granting a pension to Mary Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1867) granting a pension to Thomas B. Maberry; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1868) granting a pension to William S. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1869) granting a pension to M. C. Bixby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1870) granting a pension to J. P. Akin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1871) granting a pension to Samuel Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1872) granting a pension to James M. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1873) granting a pension to William David Allee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1874) granting a pension to Lemuel Austin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1875) granting a pension to Harriet L. Gist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1876) granting a pension to James Holmes; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1877) granting a pension to Oliver P. Jackson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1878) granting a pension to James G. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1879) granting a pension to Rhoda A. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1880) granting a pension to Robert S. Hoge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1881) granting a pension to Ozias Hawkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1882) granting a pension to Leonidas H. Hightshoe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1883) granting a pension to Julia E. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1884) granting a pension to Louisa K. Holbert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1885) granting a pension to Easter Henson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1886) granting a pension to Ira Gill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1887) granting a pension to James Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1888) granting a pension to Mordecai Gladish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1889) granting a pension to J. J. Gilliland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1890) granting a pension to Napoleon B. Goodknight; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1891) granting a pension to R. C. Goswell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1892) granting a pension to Jane D. Goss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1893) granting a pension to John Gerds; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1894) granting a pension to Mary A. Gurley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1895) granting a pension to Eliza Farries; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1896) granting a pension to R. H. Farrow; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1897) granting a pension to William England; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1898) granting a pension to Mary Esser; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1899) for the relief of John Thomas; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1900) for the relief of Dennis Sullivan; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1901) for the relief of Omar A. Du Esler; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1902) for the relief of Louis Dunham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1903) for the relief of Josiah Baugher; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1904) for the relief of Henry Stuffleham; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1905) for the relief of Greene County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1906) for the relief of Joseph W. Hawkins; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1907) for the relief of the Presbyterian Church of Glasgow, Howard County, Mo.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1908) restoring the name of Berry Weese to the pension roll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1909) to correct the military record of Charles J. Lanning; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1910) to correct the military record of Rudolph Kraut; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1911) to correct the military record of Bennett Lopp; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1912) to correct the military record of Oliver T. Worman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 1913) granting an increase of pension to Mathew Maroney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1914) granting an increase of pension to Milton Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1915) granting an increase of pension to Betsey A. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1916) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Ginty; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1917) granting an increase of pension to David A. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1918) granting an increase of pension to Merit D. Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1919) granting an increase of pension to William Russell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1920) granting an increase of pension to John H. Turpin, Jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1921) granting an increase of pension to William N. Ruggles; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1922) granting an increase of pension to George W. Hobbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1923) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Haydon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1924) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Dollarhide; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1925) granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Cox; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1926) granting an increase of pension to Monroe Abbott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1927) granting an increase of pension to George F. Blood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1928) granting an increase of pension to James Baragar; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1929) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Campbell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1930) granting an increase of pension to Linary Flatter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1931) granting an increase of pension to Faxon Hayford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1932) granting an increase of pension to John B. Shafer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1933) granting a pension to Sarah C. Ryland; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1934) granting a pension to Thomas L. Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1935) granting a pension to Almon Shibley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1936) granting a pension to Seely B. McCarthy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1937) granting a pension to Alonzo Epler; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1938) granting a pension to George W. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1939) granting a pension to Michael Goetz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1940) granting a pension to James Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1941) granting a pension to John Alexander; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1942) granting a pension to William S. Curtis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1943) granting a pension to Charles W. Clarke; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1944) for the relief of the State of Oregon; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1945) to correct the military record of J. W. La Bare; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1946) to correct the military record of Peter Kenney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1947) to correct the military record of Henry M. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1948) to correct the military record of Daniel D. May; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1949) to correct the military record of Paris R. Winslow; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1950) to correct the record of discharge of Capt. Amos Dahuff; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1951) for the relief of the legal representatives of Sydney W. Moss; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1952) to reimburse Mary E. Myers, widow of Joseph Myers, deceased, for loss of personal property sustained in depredations of Indians on the Snake River, Idaho; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KIPP: A bill (H. R. 1953) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1954) granting an increase of pension to Charles Walters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1955) granting an increase of pension to Lester T. Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1956) granting an increase of pension to W. O. Medler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1957) granting an increase of pension to Richard H. Ely; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1958) granting an increase of pension to Edwin S. Rolls; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1959) granting an increase of pension to William Spangenberg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1960) granting an increase of pension to Avilla Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1961) granting an increase of pension to Asa H. Patrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1962) granting an increase of pension to John Marley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1963) granting an increase of pension to William Hill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1964) granting an increase of pension to James P. Chaffee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1965) granting an increase of pension to John H. Summers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 1966) granting an increase of pension to Maj. C. C. Pike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1967) granting an increase of pension to John L. Clifton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRAY: A bill (H. R. 1968) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Weller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1969) granting a pension to Charles M. Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1970) for the relief of Thomas W. Williams; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TILSON: A bill (H. R. 1971) granting an increase of pension to William Cook; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1972) granting an increase of pension to Hattie L. Benedict; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: A bill (H. R. 1973) granting an increase of pension to Ann Elizabeth Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1974) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ADAIR: A bill (H. R. 1975) granting an increase of pension to David Harris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1976) granting an increase of pension to James M. Higgs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1977) granting an increase of pension to John W. Priest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1978) granting an increase of pension to William Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1979) granting an increase of pension to Rezin F. Mumma; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1980) granting an increase of pension to Andrew K. Lewis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1981) granting an increase of pension to Edward W. Larue; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1982) granting an increase of pension to John R. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1983) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Hoeffler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1984) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson R. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1985) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Pegg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1986) for the relief of William E. Murray; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ANDERSON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 1987) granting an increase of pension to Henry M. Rouse; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1988) granting an increase of pension to John T. Slackford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1989) granting an increase of pension to Bateman Zoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1990) granting an increase of pension to John Martin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 1991) granting an increase of pension to Jacob A. Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1992) granting an increase of pension to John B. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1993) granting an increase of pension to Louis H. Paulick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1994) granting an increase of pension to George Brenizer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1995) granting an increase of pension to William A. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1996) granting an increase of pension to Reaser W. Eberhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. AUSTIN: A bill (H. R. 1997) granting an increase of pension to Martha J. Stout; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1998) granting a pension to Emma McDaniel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 1999) granting a pension to Harry Harwell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 2000) granting an increase of pension to Marion Finley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARTHOLDT: A bill (H. R. 2001) for the relief of the J. Kennard & Sons' Carpet Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BOEHNE: A bill (H. R. 2002) granting an increase of pension to Willard D. Cook; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2003) granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Klotz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2004) granting an increase of pension to G. W. Roberts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2005) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Painter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2006) granting an increase of pension to William M. Myers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2007) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Schreiner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2008) granting an increase of pension to Amanda McGillum; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2009) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Westfall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2010) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Thomas; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2011) granting an increase of pension to P. R. Baldrige; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2012) granting an increase of pension to David T. Weir; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2013) granting an increase of pension to William H. Snider; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2014) granting an increase of pension to John H. Selby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2015) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2016) granting an increase of pension to William Pirkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2017) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Stewart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2018) granting an increase of pension to James P. Noel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2019) granting an increase of pension to America Mears; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2020) granting an increase of pension to John C. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2021) granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. McGarragh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2022) granting an increase of pension to Hugh J. Hales; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2023) granting an increase of pension to William H. Ficklin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2024) granting an increase of pension to Eliza J. Corn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2025) granting an increase of pension to Richard A. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2026) granting an increase of pension to Haydon Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2027) granting an increase of pension to M. M. Angleton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2028) granting an increase of pension to John Belger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2029) granting an increase of pension to John R. Carrol; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2030) granting an increase of pension to Amos Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2031) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin A. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2032) granting an increase of pension to James F. Thurman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2033) granting a pension to Martha J. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2034) granting a pension to Mary Alexander; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2035) for the relief of Abel J. Mosby; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2036) for the relief of Henry A. Polen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2037) for the relief of the legal representatives of L. H. Cook, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2038) for the relief of William Niehaus; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2039) for the relief of Henry G. Roetzel and Paul Chipman; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2040) to correct and complete the military record of Anderson G. Pittman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BORLAND: A bill (H. R. 2041) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Turner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2042) granting an increase of pension to James C. Settle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2043) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2044) granting an increase of pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2045) granting an increase of pension to John L. Sumner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2046) granting an increase of pension to James M. Steel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2047) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Williamson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2048) granting an increase of pension to William P. Crayne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2049) granting a pension to C. E. Burkitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2050) granting a pension to John W. McKissick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2051) granting a pension to Henry E. Patee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2052) granting a pension to Thomas Glynn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2053) granting a pension to Florence M. Woods; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2054) granting a pension to Charles R. Carter; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2055) for the relief of A. L. H. Crenshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2056) for the relief of the estate of William Morrison; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2057) for the relief of the estate of Robert G. Wilson, sr.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2058) to correct the military record of George H. English; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2059) granting an honorable discharge to George D. Hooker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2060) to remove the disabilities of John Farrell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2061) to remove the disability of Floyd J. Farber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2062) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Harriet L. Young, administratrix of the estate of Solomon Young, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2063) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Stephen E. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2064) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Nannie, Oscar W., John R., and Emma Cogswell, heirs of O. H. Cogswell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2065) to carry out findings of the Court of Claims in the case of the estate of Alexander Bradshaw; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. CAMERON: A bill (H. R. 2066) for the relief of A. J. Sampson; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2067) for the relief of Dr. Warren E. Day; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COPLEY: A bill (H. R. 2068) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Anderson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CARLIN: A bill (H. R. 2069) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Alice E. Davis, heir at law of John C. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2070) for the relief of the estate of Antonia Sousa, deceased; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2071) for the relief of Herbert Thompson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 2072) granting an increase of pension to Julius Cohn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2073) granting an increase of pension to Enos R. Woods; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2074) granting an increase of pension to Marcus D. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2075) granting an increase of pension to George A. Shephard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2076) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Sansom; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2077) granting an increase of pension to Claudius L. Pyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2078) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Pitts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2079) granting an increase of pension to Lee W. Putnam; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2080) granting an increase of pension to Osborn Parrish; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2081) granting an increase of pension to James W. Orvis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2082) granting an increase of pension to Christian B. Old; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2083) granting an increase of pension to Jacob G. Lobaugh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2084) granting an increase of pension to John H. Keller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2085) granting an increase of pension to Vernon L. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2086) granting an increase of pension to George R. Ingersoll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2087) granting an increase of pension to James Hudgins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2088) granting an increase of pension to Fields B. Glenn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2089) granting an increase of pension to William M. Gregg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2090) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Duncan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2091) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Crosby; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2092) granting an increase of pension to John Bridge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2093) granting an increase of pension to Garriek McCain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2094) granting an increase of pension to David Potarf; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2095) granting an increase of pension to John W. Phelps; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2096) granting an increase of pension to Jesse T. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2097) granting an increase of pension to John W. Hall; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2098) granting an increase of pension to William Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2099) granting an increase of pension to William Bybee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2100) granting an increase of pension to William H. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2101) granting an increase of pension to James F. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2102) granting an increase of pension to John Adams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2103) granting a pension to John W. Sage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2104) granting a pension to Margaret Taylor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2105) granting a pension to Roseannah Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2106) granting a pension to William L. Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2107) granting a pension to Joel Harreford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2108) granting a pension to Sudie Hopkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2109) granting a pension to Davis Woody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2110) granting a pension to Fred Yeomans; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2111) granting a pension to Martha J. Thorne; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2112) granting a pension to Anna Rogers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2113) granting a pension to Thomas G. Butner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2114) for the relief of Abraham Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2115) for the relief of W. W. Wall; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2116) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of John B. Harrelson, administrator of the estate of Nathan E. Harrelson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2117) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the matter of the claim of Elijah B. Hammontree, administrator of the estate of John Hammontree, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ESCH: A bill (H. R. 2118) granting an increase of pension to Jeshuron Bailey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2119) granting an increase of pension to Hugh Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2120) granting an increase of pension to Charles O. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2121) granting an increase of pension to Amos C. Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2122) granting an increase of pension to John W. Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2123) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dunn; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2124) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Fritz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2125) granting an increase of pension to John Landis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2126) granting an increase of pension to Tennis O. Lawrence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2127) granting an increase of pension to Herbert M. Nogle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2128) granting an increase of pension to John A. Peterson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2129) granting an increase of pension to William H. Rees; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2130) granting an increase of pension to William D. Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2131) granting an increase of pension to George H. Yarrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2132) granting a pension to Emily A. Ballard; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2133) granting a pension to Emma Burrows; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2134) granting a pension to Martin Page; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2135) to authorize the Secretary of War to issue a certificate of service in the name of Charles B. Walworth; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2136) to remove charge of desertion from military record of George W. Moore, alias George W. More; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2137) granting a medal to Herbert N. Nogle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOSTER of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 2138) for the relief of the estate of F. Z. Tucker, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 2139) granting an increase of pension to Alvin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2140) granting a pension to Peter E. Luttrell; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM: A bill (H. R. 2141) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Lyerly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2142) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Sherfy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2143) granting an increase of pension to Absalom P. Carlock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2144) granting an increase of pension to John W. Wandling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2145) granting an increase of pension to William T. Brown; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2146) granting an increase of pension to Mary W. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2147) granting an increase of pension to James P. Sarver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2148) granting a pension to Hannah Ellis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2149) granting a pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2150) removing the charge of desertion against William H. H. Edwards; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2151) to remove the charge of desertion now standing on the records against John F. Harbaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2152) for compensation for the nursing and treatment of sick soldiers of the United States by St. John's Hospital at Springfield, Ill.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2153) authorizing the Secretary of War to place the name of Joseph F. Ritherdson on the rolls of Company C, One hundred and twenty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and issue him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GILLET: A bill (H. R. 2154) for the relief of Richard W. Clifford; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2155) for the relief of Wilson B. Strong; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOOD: A bill (H. R. 2156) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Guthrie; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2157) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Brobst; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2158) granting an increase of pension to William Sills; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2159) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Spicher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2160) granting an increase of pension to Rose C. Hughes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2161) granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Dumont; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2162) granting an increase of pension to John Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2163) granting an increase of pension to Lucien F. Kellogg; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2164) granting a pension to Charles Volz; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2165) granting a pension to Otis H. Shurtliff; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2166) granting a pension to Barney Gordon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRIEST: A bill (H. R. 2167) granting an increase of pension to John S. Rodgers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2168) granting an increase of pension to Jacob H. Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2169) granting an increase of pension to George R. Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2170) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Howe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAMILTON of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 2171) granting an increase of pension to Henry Blair; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HARRISON of New York: A bill (H. R. 2172) granting a pension to Catherine Arnould; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2173) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of John Beyel and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2174) to remove the charge of desertion and insubordination from the record of Michael J. Quirk, alias Joseph McDonough, and grant him an honorable discharge; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2175) granting an increase of pension to Cecilia Quinlan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2176) granting a pension to James Tucker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 2177) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Sanford; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2178) granting an increase of pension to Charles G. Shearer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOBSON: A bill (H. R. 2179) for the relief of Tracey Edson; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 2180) granting a pension to Robert L. Henry; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HOWELL: A bill (H. R. 2181) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Westwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2182) granting an increase of pension to Temple Short; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2183) granting an increase of pension to Sarah A. Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2184) granting an increase of pension to W. N. Peirce; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2185) granting an increase of pension to William Marvin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2186) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Kelly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2187) granting an increase of pension to Margaret J. Haskell; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2188) granting an increase of pension to George F. Hodge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2189) granting an increase of pension to Chester Greenwood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2190) granting an increase of pension to John A. Grant; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2191) granting an increase of pension to Martha C. Dodge; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2192) granting an increase of pension to John W. Carroll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2193) granting an increase of pension to Charles Blanchard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2194) granting a pension to Caroline Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2195) granting a pension to Isaac Baum; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2196) granting a pension to Anna Jones Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2197) granting a pension to Elizabeth Becker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2198) granting a pension to Anna Jones Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2199) granting a pension to James Carlile; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2200) granting a pension to Alexander Cowan; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2201) granting a pension to Mary C. Higbee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2202) granting a pension to Thomas Kenney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2203) granting a pension to Temperance Moon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2204) granting a pension to James Henry Martineau; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2205) granting a pension to Louis Miller; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2206) granting a pension to John McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2207) granting a pension to Marcena De Witt McKane; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2208) granting a pension to John McLaws; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2209) granting a pension to Nymphus Murdock; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2210) granting a pension to Persis M. McKee; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2211) granting a pension to James Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2212) granting a pension to William McDonald; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2213) granting a pension to Samuel Park; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2214) granting a pension to Matilda Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2215) granting a pension to Ann Robertson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2216) granting a pension to Charlotte E. Rudd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2217) granting a pension to Thomas D. Steverson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2218) granting a pension to Margaret Ann Sperry; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2219) granting a pension to John Walker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2220) granting a pension to John Woolley; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2221) granting a pension to Harriet Wild; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2222) granting a pension to Anna L. Young; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2223) granting a pension to Nancy A. Watkins; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2224) for the relief of William P. Alexander; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2225) to correct the military record of Thomas Smith; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 2226) granting an increase of pension to James Price; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2227) granting an increase of pension to John J. Chance; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2228) granting an increase of pension to Nelson Burris; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2229) granting an increase of pension to Victor B. Crowell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2230) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Huffman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2231) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Porter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2232) granting a pension to Neill Wallace; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2233) for the relief of Mary J. McGlothlen; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KONOP: A bill (H. R. 2234) granting an increase of pension to John Fellon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2235) granting an increase of pension to William S. Halladay; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McGUIRE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 2236) granting an increase of pension to L. B. Nichols; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2237) granting an increase of pension to William H. Staples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2238) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. James; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McHENRY: A bill (H. R. 2239) granting a pension to Charles W. Faux, alias Charles M. Ward; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2240) granting a pension to Sarah Ann Wittenmeyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2241) granting a pension to Sarah Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2242) granting a pension to William K. Wertman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2243) granting a pension to Frederick Wagner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2244) granting a pension to Oscar S. Thornton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2245) granting a pension to Laura C. Robison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2246) granting a pension to Francis B. Savage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2247) granting a pension to Jacob M. Stratiff; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2248) granting a pension to Edwin H. Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2249) granting a pension to Emma B. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2250) granting a pension to Warren W. Klinger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2251) granting a pension to Jeremiah Love; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2252) granting a pension to Jane McNalley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2253) granting a pension to Kate H. Lovett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2254) granting a pension to Jacob Kelchner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2255) granting a pension to Mary Alice John; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2256) granting a pension to Luther L. Kauffman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2257) granting a pension to Andrew J. Hackley, alias Thomas Jefferson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2258) granting a pension to Jane Heist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2259) granting a pension to Sophia G. Eckman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2260) granting a pension to William H. Eoute; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2261) granting a pension to Ellen Gunton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2262) granting a pension to Michael S. Dietrich; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2263) granting a pension to Alfred Dressler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2264) granting a pension to Charles C. Diehl; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2265) granting a pension to Harriet Barnd; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2266) granting a pension to Emma Bound; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2267) granting a pension to Emma Crewitt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2268) granting a pension to Mary E. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2269) granting a pension to Benjamin E. Kneibler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2270) granting a pension to Harry W. Albeck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2271) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Zerbe; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2272) granting an increase of pension to John G. Woolley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2273) granting an increase of pension to William Walt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2274) granting an increase of pension to Joel W. Strohecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2275) granting an increase of pension to William H. Utt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2276) granting an increase of pension to William Stephens; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2277) granting an increase of pension to Abraham Strasser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2278) granting an increase of pension to William Spotts; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2279) granting an increase of pension to John N. Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2280) granting an increase of pension to William Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2281) granting an increase of pension to Charles P. Sloan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2282) granting an increase of pension to Christopher Sigmund; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2283) granting an increase of pension to James Sheap; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2284) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Search; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2285) granting an increase of pension to David Ruckel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2286) granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Riddell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2287) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Raver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2288) granting an increase of pension to John Powell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2289) granting an increase of pension to John Nungesser; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2290) granting an increase of pension to William H. Morton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2291) granting an increase of pension to J. Hunter Miles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2292) granting an increase of pension to Jesse Metz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2293) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Leib; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2294) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Knarr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2295) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kearns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2296) granting an increase of pension to Lorenzo D. Kase; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2297) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2298) granting an increase of pension to John N. Hart; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2299) granting an increase of pension to Charles Garner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2300) granting an increase of pension to William H. Francis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2301) granting an increase of pension to Joseph L. Frame; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2302) granting an increase of pension to Alem B. Fisher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2303) granting an increase of pension to George Duke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2304) granting an increase of pension to Charles Dietrich; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2305) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Croft; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2306) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Crague; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2307) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Conner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2308) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Bubb; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2309) granting an increase of pension to Gideon Beishline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2310) for the relief of J. K. Beltz; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2311) for the relief of Jeremiah Rader; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2312) for the relief of Joseph G. Swank; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2313) for the relief of Louisa Weaver; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2314) authorizing the Secretary of War to bestow a medal of honor upon Lieut. Russell Karns; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINLEY: A bill (H. R. 2315) granting an increase of pension to Richard Harkness; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2316) granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Butcher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2317) granting an increase of pension to Noah Tohill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2318) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth F. Peddecord; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2319) granting an increase of pension to James S. Gustin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2320) granting an increase of pension to George M. Bence; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2321) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Martin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2322) granting an increase of pension to Albert Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2323) granting an increase of pension to Enoch Walker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2324) granting an increase of pension to William Vandeventer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2325) granting an increase of pension to Oliver P. Helton; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2326) granting an increase of pension to Nathan Grover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2327) granting an increase of pension to William R. Rennels; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2328) granting an increase of pension to Martin Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2329) granting an increase of pension to Jesse M. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2330) granting an increase of pension to J. A. McCoskey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2331) granting an increase of pension to John Helt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2332) granting an increase of pension to David O. Giffin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2333) granting an increase of pension to David Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2334) granting an increase of pension to Clarkson Tryon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2335) granting an increase of pension to William Gray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2336) granting an increase of pension to John H. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2337) granting an increase of pension to Michael Welch; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2338) granting a pension to Archibald Van Deren; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2339) granting a pension to Anna Howell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2340) granting a pension to W. H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2341) granting a pension to Frank J. Himes; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2342) granting a pension to John S. Kernus; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2343) granting a pension to Lena I. Stevenson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2344) to remove the charge of desertion against John McElhiney; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2345) to correct the military record of A. C. Burk; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2346) to correct the military record of John Healy; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2347) to correct the military record of Lewis Rankin; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2348) to correct the military record of Norman B. Roberts; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2349) for the relief of Francis M. Watrous; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McKINNEY: A bill (H. R. 2350) granting an increase of pension to Matthew H. Jamison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MILLER: A bill (H. R. 2351) granting an increase of pension to Nancy W. Coffey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2352) granting an increase of pension to James Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2353) granting a pension to Olena M. Hagenson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2354) granting a pension to Ellen Weiler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2355) granting a pension to Kate Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2356) granting a pension to Thomas Lang; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2357) granting a pension to Charles I. Heywood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2358) granting a pension to Edward Wilson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2359) to refund certain tonnage taxes and light dues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 2360) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hartman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2361) granting an increase of pension to Evan Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2362) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Mann; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2363) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Barr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2364) granting an increase of pension to James Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2365) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Kresge; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2366) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Shell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2367) granting an increase of pension to Harrison Brecht; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2368) granting an increase of pension to Elmer E. Frederick; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2369) granting an increase of pension to George W. Heim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2370) granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Warner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2371) granting an increase of pension to Henry Zellner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2372) granting an increase of pension to Thompson Decker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2373) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Moyer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2374) granting an increase of pension to Morris Ecker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2375) granting an increase of pension to John Burger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2376) granting an increase of pension to Martin Creahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2377) granting an increase of pension to Isiah Snyder; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2378) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Fitzpatrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2379) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Vogel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2380) granting an increase of pension to George Starnner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2381) granting an increase of pension to Henry Whidrick; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2382) granting an increase of pension to George King; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2383) granting an increase of pension to Theodore Weaver; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2384) granting an increase of pension to William Peltz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2385) granting an increase of pension to William J. Ramsey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PATTEN of New York: A bill (H. R. 2386) granting an increase of pension to Laura Shelby Converse; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RANDELL of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2387) for the relief of W. J. Bilderbacker; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2388) for the relief of Nancy M. Cockham, heir of Olirley Fairchilds, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2389) for the relief of the heirs of John Oliver, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2390) for the relief of the widow and the heirs of Daniel R. Wright, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2391) for the relief of the heirs of Rebecca James, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2392) for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Riley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RIORDAN: A bill (H. R. 2393) for the relief of the American West Indies Trading Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2394) granting a pension to Henrietta Sherman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROBINSON: A bill (H. R. 2395) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Beck; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2396) granting an increase of pension to Oliver Ayers; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2397) granting an increase of pension to J. B. Megahan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2398) granting an increase of pension to Albert McConnell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2399) granting an increase of pension to Stephen Konicka; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2400) granting a pension to A. G. Hamilton, alias Garland Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2401) granting a pension to Thomas H. Hicks; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2402) granting a pension to Anne E. Preddy; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2403) granting a pension to Samuel A. Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2404) granting a pension to B. E. De Vall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2405) granting a pension to Sarah L. Peters; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2406) granting a pension to Thomas S. Garen; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2407) granting a pension to David Hubert; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2408) granting a pension to Rhoda L. Hendricks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2409) granting a pension to Minnie Bryant; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2410) granting a pension to Misses M. E. and S. J. Gladney; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2411) granting a pension to Nancy E. Williams; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2412) granting a pension to William B. Howard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2413) granting a pension to Phoebe A. Montgomery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2414) granting a pension to Albert I. Merrill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2415) granting a pension to Julius C. Parrott; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2416) granting a pension to John B. Clark; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2417) granting a pension to G. A. Joyner; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2418) granting a pension to Charles Woolston; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2419) for the relief of Margaret Hardwick; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2420) for the relief of Thomas J. Estes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2421) for the relief of H. C. Chase; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2422) for the relief of Mrs. M. A. Hibbard; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2423) for the relief of Lizzie E. McCord, administratrix of Moses S. McCord, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2424) for the relief of William M. West; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2425) for the relief of Annie H. Rainey and heirs of William S. Rainey; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2426) for the relief of the heirs of W. L. Dillon; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2427) for the relief of W. J. Massey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2428) for the relief of the heirs of Miles Knowlton; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2429) for the relief of the heirs of John G. Freeman, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2430) for the relief of the heirs of John H. Austin, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2431) for the relief of the heirs of Mary Edwards, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2432) for the relief of the heirs of George Sink; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2433) for the relief of the heirs of G. W. Morris; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2434) for the relief of the heirs of William W. Davis, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2435) for the relief of the heirs of Thomas O. Burkhead; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2436) for the relief of the heirs of J. A. Patillo; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2437) for the relief of the heirs of Marguerite E. Dennis; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2438) for the relief of the heirs of Eliza Ann Ashcraft; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2439) for the relief of the heirs of Susan McCurley, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2440) for the relief of the heirs or estate of Jesse E. Lacey, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2441) for the relief of the heirs of Azraih Mitchell; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2442) for the relief of the heirs of Wesley W. Wallace; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2443) for the relief of the heirs of Levander Jenkins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2444) for the relief of the heirs of the late Jennie Hunter; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2445) for the relief of the heirs of the late Hugh Rowen; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2446) for the relief of the heirs of H. S. Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2447) for the relief of the heirs of John J. Johnson, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2448) for the relief of the heirs of David R. Lamb; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2449) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2450) for the relief of the heirs of John Kirk; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2451) for the relief of the estate of J. H. Moseby, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2452) for the relief of the estate of James Scull; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2453) for the relief of the estate of Moses S. McCord; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2454) for the relief of the estate of Amanda E. Buck, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2455) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of Virginia A. Jones, administratrix of Samuel J. Jones, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2456) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William A. Bethel, administrator of Martha Harrison, deceased, and Oliver P. Lister; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2457) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of William E. Floyd, administrator of Asa Crow, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2458) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of heirs of Thaddeus N. Ferrell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2459) for the relief of the legal representatives of Dr. W. D. Barnett, deceased, late of Cleveland County, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2460) for the relief of the trustees of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Pine Bluff, Ark.; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. ROBERTS of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 2461) to provide for the repayment of the ransom of Ellen M. Stone; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RUSSELL: A bill (H. R. 2462) granting an increase of pension to James N. Hamilton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2463) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Forbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2464) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Elwood Mason; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2465) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Pride; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2466) granting an increase of pension to James Crain; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2467) granting a pension to A. M. Huckstep; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SCULLY: A bill (H. R. 2468) granting an increase of pension to Barzillar P. Irons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHARP: A bill (H. R. 2469) granting an increase of pension to Llewellyn W. French; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2470) granting an increase of pension to T. S. Dexter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2471) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Rail; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2472) granting an increase of pension to William Rech; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2473) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2474) granting an increase of pension to John Rexford; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2475) granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Gatton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2476) granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2477) granting a pension to Frank Richardson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2478) granting relief to Thomas E. Osborn; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2479) to place Jonathan J. McClarren on the retired list with the rank of captain; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STANLEY: A bill (H. R. 2480) granting an increase of pension to Louisa Jacobs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2481) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2482) granting an increase of pension to John Coombs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2483) granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel S. Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2484) granting an increase of pension to Marcus E. Cartwright; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2485) granting an increase of pension to Perry Knox; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2486) granting an increase of pension to William A. Parker; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2487) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Pearce; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2488) granting an increase of pension to Catharine May; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2489) granting a pension to Emmett Puckett; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2490) granting a pension to Edwin Cline; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2491) granting a pension to Sophia Goodman; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2492) granting a pension to Mary S. Overby; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2493) granting a pension to William E. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2494) granting a pension to Columbus Wise; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2495) granting a pension to Stephen H. Harrel; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2496) granting a pension to William H. Jones; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2497) granting a pension to Robert S. Hill; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2498) granting a pension to Ulysses S. Davis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2499) granting a pension to George Price; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2500) for the relief of George D. Blakey; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2501) for the relief of Francis M. Price; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2502) for the relief of Frank W. Clark; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2503) for the relief of Walter Langley; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2504) for the relief of George W. Lackey, surviving partner of the firm of William Lackey & Sons; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of the estate of John M. Higgins, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2506) for the relief of the estate of W. C. Russell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2507) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of A. W. Richards, administrator of estate of Kinchen Bell, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas: A bill (H. R. 2508) to enroll James B. Nichols and others as Choctaw Indians in Oklahoma; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. STERLING: A bill (H. R. 2509) granting an increase of pension to Absolom Wood; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2510) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Smedley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2511) granting an increase of pension to William T. Gibbs; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2512) granting an increase of pension to John Walsh; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2513) granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Swaim; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2514) granting an increase of pension to Charles Van Scholek; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2515) granting an increase of pension to James P. Grove; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2516) granting an increase of pension to William Burrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2517) granting an increase of pension to John T. Starr; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2518) granting an increase of pension to John Nelson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2519) granting an increase of pension to Willet Van Winkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2520) granting an increase of pension to Thomas S. Murray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2521) granting an increase of pension to Seraphim T. Thery; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2522) granting an increase of pension to William Jones; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2523) granting an increase of pension to Preston Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2524) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Mishler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2525) granting an increase of pension to George W. Gallagher; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2526) granting an increase of pension to John H. Watson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2527) granting an increase of pension to George P. McClellan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2528) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shropshire; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2529) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Allen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2530) granting an increase of pension to James Downey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2531) granting an increase of pension to James W. McMillen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2532) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Owen; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2533) granting an increase of pension to John S. Bray; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2534) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Banks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2535) granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Proctor; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2536) granting an increase of pension to Job J. Whiteman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2537) granting an increase of pension to George W. Horine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2538) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Stauffer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2539) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Z. Stine; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2540) granting an increase of pension to Thomas F. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2541) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Morgan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2542) granting an increase of pension to James M. Latham; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2543) granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus G. Peppel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2544) granting an increase of pension to Aaron Will; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2545) granting an increase of pension to Russell Puntene; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2546) granting an increase of pension to William C. Rike; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2547) granting an increase of pension to John W. Towner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2548) granting an increase of pension to Henry Hazenwinkle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2549) granting an increase of pension to Ezekiel Justice; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2550) granting an increase of pension to William Sutton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2551) granting a pension to William L. Archer; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2552) granting a pension to Andrew J. Bess; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2553) granting a pension to Clark Conners; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2554) granting a pension to William E. Gilchrist; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2555) granting a pension to Anna F. Haddock; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2556) granting a pension to Maria Fix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2557) granting a pension to Francis M. Phares; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2558) granting a pension to Jean B. Kopf; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2559) granting a pension to Emma S. Gates; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2560) for the relief of Joseph M. Howe; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2561) to correct the military record of William Schroeder; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2562) to correct the military record of John B. Ford; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2563) to remove the charge of desertion against Ephraim H. Gallion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 2564) granting an increase of pension to Henry Selover; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2565) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Seymour; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2566) granting an increase of pension to Alfred S. Weymouth; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2567) granting an increase of pension to James P. Aney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2568) granting a pension to Mary Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2569) granting a pension to Regina Ebert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2570) granting a pension to Mary Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2571) for the relief of Lydia Mahoney; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2572) for the relief of the McBride Electric Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2573) for the relief of Michael Flaherty, guardian of John Flaherty, claimant; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2574) to correct the military record of Andrew J. Weidle; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 2575) for the relief of the estate of Robert M. Cannon, administrator; to the Committee on War Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Evidence to accompany the bill introduced for the special relief of Reason W. Eberhardt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. COPLEY: Petition of citizens of Glen Ellyn, Ill., against the establishment of a parcels post, and protest of citizens of Aurora, Ill., against the establishment of a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of the eleventh district of Illinois, favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of the Union League Club of the city of New York, indorsing the action of the President in calling the extra session of Congress, and favoring Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Socialists of La Crosse, Wis., against increased rate of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of George D. Eggleston Post, No. 133, Grand Army of the Republic, of Appleton, Wis., urging passage of H. R. 23846, of the third session of the Sixty-first Congress, commonly known as the "Suloway bill"; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of Wisconsin associations of creamery owners and managers, against Hepburn bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Wisconsin citizens, favoring election of United States Senators by direct vote; to the Committee on Election of President, Vice President, and Representatives in Congress.

Also, petition of the Trempealeau County Union of the American Society of Equity, in favor of retaining the present 10-cent tax on all colored oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Wisconsin citizens, against Canadian reciprocity; petition of citizens of Wisconsin, favoring retention of duty on barley and oleomargarine; and resolution of the American Protective Tariff League of New York City, opposed to the adoption of the Canadian reciprocity agreement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of citizens of Streator, Ill., for the creation of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of American Protection Tariff League, in opposition to Canadian reciprocity; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, papers to accompany bill for relief of Alvin Green; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of citizens of Belvidere, Ill., concerning donation of public lands to Archbishop of Santa Fe, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. GOOD: Petition of 44 citizens of Cedar Rapids, Iowa, against accepting the silver service offered by the State of Utah for the battleship *Utah*; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. GARDNER of Massachusetts: Petition of 150 residents of Haverhill, Mass., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petition of 244 residents of Newburyport, Mass., favoring the establishment of a national department of health; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

By Mr. GREGG of Pennsylvania: Petition of South Side Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Butler, Pa., favoring passage of Miller-Curtis bill, (1) to protect dry territory by excluding liquors from interstate-commerce protection; (2) the Curtis bill, to prohibit saloons in Hawaii; (3) the McCumber-Terrell bill, to forbid liquor selling in ships and buildings used by the United States Government; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, insisting upon the building of the battleship *New York* in compliance with the law of 1910; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petitions of Bolivar Lodge, No. 570, of Bolivar, Pa., and America's Pride Council, No. 952, of Export, Pa., Junior Order United American Mechanics, in favor of illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. HOWELL: Petition signed by Mrs. H. S. Townsend, W. F. Swan, F. Dunsterberg, and other citizens of Utah, protesting against any increase in second-class rates of postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. KONOP: Petition against parcels post by J. W. Bassett and others, of Lena, Wis.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Kaukauna, and Henry Jonen, of South Kaukauna, and other citizens of adjoining towns, favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition against parcels post by Thomas F. De Wave and others, of Cooperstown; G. J. Stodola, of Brageau; and R. D. Zuehlke and others, of Suring, Wis.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. MORGAN: Petition of 150 citizens of Oklahoma City, Okla., favoring the establishment of a national health department; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Interior Department.

Also, petitions from various citizens and business firms of Waynoka, Avard, Woodward, Moorland, Alva, Cherokee, Ingersoll, Carmen, Okeene, Ringwood, Oklahoma City, El Reno, Yukon, Cement, Apache, Anadarko, Luther, Geary, Taloga, Okla., protesting against a parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. McMORRAN: Petitions of D. A. Fraser and 6 others, of Port Huron, Allen Phillips and 15 others of Port Huron, E. P. Draper and 8 others of Allenton, Mrs. Mary Russell and 26 others of Silverwood, all of Michigan, favoring the Miller-Curtis bill (S. 7528 and H. R. 23641); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petitions of Fred. W. Pohley and 24 others, of Avoca, St. Clair County, and William R. Simons and 37 others of China Township, St. Clair County, Mich., favoring parcels post; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition adopted by the Republican caucus of Goodland Township, Lapeer County, against the passage of the Canadian reciprocity bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SAMUEL W. SMITH: Petition of Theodore Munger and 55 others, of Rochester, Mich., relative to the conservation of the soil; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHARP: Protest of citizens of Greenwich, Ohio, against reduction in wool schedule; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. UTTER: Resolutions of the Polish National Alliance, Group No. 1180, of Woonsocket, R. I., against further restriction of immigration; resolutions of Local Union No. 1831, Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, of Arctic, R. I., favoring an illiteracy test for immigrants; resolutions of Street Sweepers' Union No. 13114, of Pawtucket, R. I., favoring an illiteracy test for immigrants; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, statement of the adjutant general of Rhode Island, in support of the so-called militia pay bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, resolution of Providence Division, No. 57, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, for an investigation concerning dairy products and for the repeal of the 10 per cent tax on oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, remonstrance of Fletcher W. Lawton, Henry K. Littlefield, and John T. Gardner, members of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, protesting, in behalf of the fishing interests in and about Newport, R. I., against ratification of the proposed reciprocity agreement with Canada relative to fish; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Woonsocket, R. I., favoring the establishment of a department of public health; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOOD of New Jersey: Papers to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Ann Elizabeth Kitchin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, resolutions of Washington Camp, No. 79, Patriotic Order Sons of America, of Frenchtown, N. J., urging the immediate passage of H. R. 15413, Sixty-first Congress, providing for additional legislation for checking undesirable immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Millstone Valley Grange, No. 169, Patrons of Husbandry, of Millstone, N. J., urging the passage of a bill providing for the correction of the defects in the Federal statutes governing the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, affidavits to accompany bill granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, April 6, 1911.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Ulysses G. B. Pierce, D. D.

LE ROY PERCY, a Senator from the State of Mississippi, appeared in his seat to-day.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read and approved.

REFERENCE BUREAUS IN LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting a special report relative to the legislative reference bureaus in the Library of Congress (S. Doc. No. 7), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on the Library and ordered to be printed.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel schooner *Yeatman*, Roger Crane, master (S. Doc. No. 5), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the findings of fact and conclusions of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims set out in the annexed findings by the court relating to the vessel brig *Sally*, James Wallace, master (S. Doc. No. 4), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a joint memorial of the Legislature of the State of Montana, which was referred to the